National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 21. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1865. WHOLE NO. 1,321.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

5 South Fifth Street, Philadelphia.

LETTERS should be addressed to *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

ANOTHER DECLARATION BY PROVISIONAL GOV. PERRY.

MESSAGE TO HIS SOUTH CAROLINA CONVENTION.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, SOUTH CAROLINA.

To the Members of the State Convention:

GENTLEMEN: You have been convened in obedience to the proclamation of his Excellency Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, for the purpose of organizing a State Government, "whereby justice may be established, domestic tranquillity insured, and loyal citizens protected in all their rights of life, liberty, and property." As Provisional Governor of the State of South Carolina, under whose orders you were elected and have assembled, it is proper that I should address you on the present occasion, and assist you, if I can, in restoring our beloved State "to her constitutional relation to the Federal Government," and aid you by my suggestions, in presenting "such a republican form of State Government as will entitle South Carolina to the guarantee of the United States therefor, and her people to protection, by the United States against invasion, insurrection, and domestic violence."

The great political convulsions which have recently taken place in the Southern States, and the terrific war which has swept over South Carolina, devastating her territory and depriving her citizens of all civil government, are too well known to you, and too painful in their detail, for me to bring them unnecessarily in review before you. Instead of dwelling on the past and grieving over its errors and misfortunes, let us, with manly fortitude, look to the future, and accommodate ourselves to the circumstances which surround us, and which cannot be changed or avoided.

The President of the United States has manifested a generous and patriotic solicitude for the restoration of the Southern States to all their civil and political rights, under the Constitution and laws of the United States. *He desires to see the Federal Union reconstructed as it was before the secession of these States; and he will oppose the centralization of power in Congress, and the infringement of the constitutional rights of the States, with the same zeal, energy, and power with which he resisted the assumed right of secession on the part of the States.* In order to accomplish this reunion of the States, the President desires that South Carolina, as well as all the other States in rebellion, should accept, as inevitable and unavoidable, the great final results of the war.

Moreover, it is impossible for South Carolina ever to regain her civil rights and be restored to the Union till she voluntarily abolishes Slavery, and declares, by an organic law, that neither "Slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted," shall ever again exist within the limits of the State. *Until this is done, we shall be kept under military rule, and the negroes will be protected as "freedmen" by the whole military force of the United States.* But I know that you are all honorable men, as well as patriotic men, and will do your duty faithfully to yourselves and your country, *however painful it may be.*

In making this unavoidable change in your Constitution, abolishing Slavery, and which will require the substitution of hired labor for that of slave labor, it is to be hoped that none of those evils will be experienced which some have anticipated. Bya wise, just, and humane treatment of your "freedmen" and women, you may attach them to you as strongly in their new condition as they were while our slaves. They will soon learn to see and feel their dependence on you, and know that their interests require them to be true and faithful to you. It is to be expected that so great and sudden a change as this in the condition of the negro will produce at first confusion, idleness, and dissatisfaction. This, however, will only be temporary. Time and experience must bring order and system. The "freedman" will soon find out that he must work or perish. Legislation will necessarily be required to regulate the relative duties of the employer and employé.

It is very desirable that you should avail yourselves of the present opportunity of reforming and popularizing the State Constitution in several particulars. It is the reproach of South Carolina abroad that her Constitution is less popular and republican in its provisions than that of any other State in the Union. And it is thought by many that to this cause alone may be traced the origin of that discontent and dissatisfaction with the Federal Government which, after being nursed for thirty-three or four years, ended in the secession or rebellion of thirteen or fourteen States.

The basis of representation in the Senate of this State, as you know, is entirely arbitrary, and founded on no just principles of property or population. At the time it was adopted—more than 75 years ago—it was, no doubt, fair and equal. But since that time the entire relative condition of election districts has changed. The upper country, at the adoption of our State Constitution in 1790, was comparatively but newly settled, had a sparse population and very little wealth. But, since that time, this portion of the State has increased in wealth and numbers in a much greater ratio than the lower country. Hence it is that the Parish representation in the Senate is unequal and unjust. Twenty or thirty votes in one of the Parishes, whose population and taxation combined entitle it to only one member in the House of Representatives, have the same representation in the Senate that 3,000 voters have in Edgefield District, whose population and taxation entitle it to six members in the House. This is contrary to all republican principles of political justice and equality.

In the early history of South Carolina the representation in the Parishes was repeatedly changed to equalize it among the respective Election Districts. But all such changes have been obstinately refused during the last 75 years. Now that slavery is abolished, a reformation in this respect is imperative and must be adopted. In effecting this change, it would be well to adopt the basis of representation in the House of Representatives, which is founded on population and taxation. Each Judicial District in the State should, however, have a Senator, and the City of Charleston two, in addition to one from the District of Charleston. The other Senators, if the present number be retained, may be given to the largest districts in population and taxation, as fractions are now represented in the House of Representatives. The two great elements of representative governments are wealth and population, and they should be both equally represented, so that the one cannot legislate to the injury of the other.

The question of suffrage, and who shall exercise the right of voting in South Carolina, is one of grave importance, and must be settled by you in your new Constitution. In 1790, the State Constitution declared that no one should be allowed to vote unless he was a freeholder or tax-payer and a free white man of the age of 21 years. In 1810, the right of suffrage was extended to all free white men of the age of 21, who were residents of the State two years, and of the Election District six months, previous to voting. The qualification of a freehold or the payment of a tax was no longer required. It was thought proper at that period that a free white man who had to serve in the militia, do patrol duty, work on the roads, and defend his country in time of war, should be allowed to vote for members of the Legislature and other officers of the State, without the ownership of freehold or the payment of taxes. To extend this universal suffrage to the "freedmen" in their present ignorant and degraded condition, would be little less than folly and madness. It would be giving to the man of wealth and large landed possessions in the State a most undue influence in all elections. He would be enabled to march to the polls, with his two or three hundred "freedmen" as employés, voting as he directed, and control all elections. The poor white men in the election districts would have no influence, or their influence would be everpowered by one man of large landed estate. In Connecticut, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and several other non-slaveholding States at the North, free negroes and colored persons are entirely excluded from voting. In most of the Northern States there is a property qualification required of all voters, which excludes them. If the New York qualifications of a freehold for a person of color voting were adopted in South Carolina, very few of the freedmen in this State would ever be able to exercise the right of suffrage. In North Carolina, Tennessee, and perhaps other slaveholding States, free negroes formerly were entitled to vote, but it is understood that they seldom saw proper to exercise this franchise.

The radical Republican party North are looking with great interest to the action of the Southern States in reference to negro suffrage, and while they admit that a man should be able to read and write and have a property qualification in order to vote, yet they contend that there should be no distinction between voters on account of color. They forget that this is a white man's government, and intended for white men only; and that the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the negro is not an American citizen under the Federal Constitution. That each and every State of the Union has the unquestioned right of deciding for herself who shall exercise the right of suffrage, is beyond all dispute. You will settle this grave question as the interest and honor of the State demand.

I have the gratification of informing you that the policy I have pursued in my administration of the Provisional Government of the State has met the entire approval of the President, and he has directed the military authorities not to interfere with that policy, but to aid and assist me in carrying it out. I have likewise the pleasure of communicating to you that very recently I had an interview with Maj.-Gen. Meade, commanding the Atlantic States, and Maj.-Gen. Gillmore, commanding the Department of South Carolina, in reference to a seeming conflict between the civil and military authorities of the State, and that all difficulties were satisfactorily arranged. The civil law, the courts, and civil officers of the State are restored, and their functions will not be interfered with by the military authorities, except in cases where freedmen and persons of color are concerned. These cases have been assigned to the Courts of the Provost-Marshals for adjudication, till the completion of the President's policy of reconstruction. All other cases will be heard and decided by the civil and municipal courts under and according to the laws of South Carolina.

It is also a source of congratulation to know that the colored troops, whose atrocious conduct has disgraced the service and filled the public mind with the most horrible apprehensions, have been withdrawn from the interior of the State, and are to be placed in garrisons on the coast, where they can do no further mischief. In all of my personal interviews with the President, and in all of my dispatches to him, I urged this course most earnestly. The white troops are, I believe, doing their duty beneficially to the country, in preserving the peace and good order of the State. It is thought that their presence among us for some time yet will be necessary, in order to enforce the relative duties of the freedmen and their employers.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I would invoke the Almighty to watch over your deliberations and direct your actions in every particular, to the best interests, honor, and glory of our beloved State.

B. F. PERRY.

ARGUMENT AGAINST NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

From the N. Y. Observer.

[We have already very clearly expressed our opinion that the right of suffrage should be extended to those and those only who are qualified by intelligence and character to vote, and that this is a question left by the Constitution to the States themselves. The writer of the following article wishes to restrict the suffrage to the whites exclusively.—*Eds. of N. Y. Obs.*]

WE are told that the negro is entitled to equal political rights, as the reward of his loyalty, because of the noble stand which he has taken in our national struggle. He has almost invariably been found on the side of the Stars and Stripes. He has succored our prisoners, and betrayed our enemies. He has fought side by side with our sons and our brothers; and none has fought more nobly, more bravely. Having defended our rights, ofttimes with the most fearful sacrifice, shall we now refuse him a share in those rights? Shall we deny him the poor privilege of voting?

I know that this argument has appealed most strongly to our hearts. It has been almost irresistible. We have felt such admiration for the devotion of these poor blacks. We have been filled with so much gratitude for their timely aid, that our better judgment has been well nigh silenced, and the heart has almost conquered the head. But I ask any intelligent citizen: Is the argument sound? Because a man can fight well, does it therefore follow that he can *vote* well? Do the qualities that make a good *soldier* necessarily make a good *voter?* Is there any connection between the two?

But we are told again, that right and justice demand that the proscription of color and race be abolished. I am at a loss to imagine where this demand of right and justice has been discovered. Is it in our Constitution? How then is it that the framers of that Constitution never dreamed that it contained such a demand? One would suppose that they were as well fitted to understand the meaning of the Constitution as we are. How is it that this right was not discovered half a century ago? How is it that it escaped the notice of a Washington, a Webster, a Clay? The truth is, the Constitution contains no such demand.

But perhaps the advocates of this policy refer to the abstract principles of right and justice, as laid down in the higher law of God, which they truly say is above all constitutions and human enactments.

But I ask, in what book, chapter or verse of God's Word do they find this right? Does the Bible anywhere, either in its letter or spirit, demand universal suffrage? Does prophet or apostle of Christ anywhere tell us that we have no right to form a government without this policy? Does even the golden rule, in its broadest, fullest interpretation, require us to take any such action? Its teachings are, that in every relation of life, as individuals, or societies, or governments, we are to seek the highest good of our fellow-men, equally with our own; and that we are to endeavor to advance their true interests by all the means in our power. But it leaves the carrying out of these principles to the Christian judgment and conscience of every man and of every nation. The question still remains—and the Bible does not answer it—is universal suffrage best and wisest? Is it adapted to secure the greatest good to all?

To offer the right of suffrage to the negro slave, from whose soul we have but just struck off the shackles of the most degrading bondage, is madness, let who will advocate it! It is vain to argue that the African slave is as intelligent as the low Irish. Even granting it, we demand of this foreign element five years' residence amid our civilization, and refinement, and Christianity, before we allow them to exercise the rights of citizenship. We do not admit them at once to the ballot-box. Would that we had never consented to admit them! Would that they also were excluded from the right of suffrage! Such a deliverance would be almost the salvation of our nation. But because our cities are to-day ruled by this mass of ignorance and degradation; because our land is already staggering under this terrible incubus, shall we double the load by adding this additional burden? Because the doors are already open too wide, shall we throw them wider open? May a kind Providence save us from such an act of folly! I plead not for our own sakes alone, but no less for the sake of this poor, degraded race, when I ask every American citizen, every Christian philanthropist, to oppose this blind and rash policy that threatens to involve whites and blacks alike in one common ruin. I thank God we have a President to-day who, we have reason to hope, will not regard the mad cry of the fanatics who are at the head of this movement! To him, I believe, we may safely, under God, trust the settlement of this question.

Andrew Johnson understands too well what slavery is, to believe that the slave needs no apprenticeship or education to place him on an equal footing with the sons of the Pilgrims. And his whole past history assures us that he has too firm a will to be swayed against his judgment by the current of popular opinion or passion, however violent.

But the advocates of universal suffrage (many of them at least) admit all that can be said with regard to the ignorance and degradation of the negro. They admit that he is not fitted to vote intelligently or independently. But they tell us that we need his vote to balance the Irish Catholic element in our country, and save us from the encroachments of Romanism. Beautiful republicanism this! So it is not for the rights of an oppressed race, after all, that we are contending? Oh, no! But we want to secure this arm of power, this tool, this mighty instrument, to enable us to secure our own ends. A party in our nation wishes, in plain English, to add six hundred thousand voters to its ranks whom it can twist and bend to suit its pleasure. I need not ask—is there any party, are there any political leaders in our land, pure enough, honest enough, for us to be willing to entrust to them such irresponsible power? Is this in accordance with the principles or "theory of our Government?" Is it safe? Is it republican? Can the end sought justify the use of such means for its attainment?

But are we sure, even, that the result would not disappoint us? Are we sure that the negro element would prove in the end a balancing power against the Irish Catholic element? Is not ignorance always controlled by the worst and most unscrupulous demagogues? Has not this been proved true in all our past history, and in the history of every nation on earth? Would it be surprising if we should find Catholic and Negro fighting under the same banner, upholding the same principles, guided by the same leaders in their unholy crusade against all that is true and right? I know this may be considered by some an absurd hypothesis. They may think it impossible for the negro to be persuaded to join hands with the enemies of our Government. I will simply say in answer, that I know a case in point here. In one of the towns of New York State (the name of which I could mention, were it necessary), every negro entitled to a vote last fall cast that vote, to a man, against the Administration and for its enemies. I ask the advocates of negro suffrage to ponder this fact. It may be only a straw; but I am very much mistaken if it does not show at least which way the current *may* run. If this was true in one town, it might prove true in other towns. If it was true in New York State, it might prove true in South Carolina or Georgia.

Let us not "unchain the tiger," in the hope that we shall find in him a useful ally, lest he prove our most dangerous foe! Let us not attempt to balance one mass of ignorance by another mass, lest we find both occupying the same scale and dragging us down by their united weight and power to an irremediable destruction. May God save us from such a fate!

HENRICUS.

NEW YORK REPUBLICANISM.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION AT SYRACUSE, SEPT. 20.

THE Hon. Henry J. Raymond, on behalf of the Committee on Resolutions, read the following resolutions:

Resolved, That while we deplore the death by assassination of Abraham Lincoln, as closing a career of transcendent usefulness and honor, and as a great national calamity, we recognize in Andrew Johnson, his successor, a statesman of ability, experience, and high-toned patriotism, and the most unsullied integrity, and one who has rendered invaluable services to the Union cause during the rebellion, and whose single-hearted devotion to the permanent prosperity and glory of our common country, commands the respect and confidence of the American people; and that we renew to him in his administration those assurances of cordial and effective support which were tendered by us in his nomination and election.

Resolved, That we approve, as eminently wise and just, the sentiments of kindness and confidence which President Johnson has evinced toward those of the communities and individuals lately in rebellion, who accept the perpetuation of the Union and the perpetual prohibition of slavery as the legitimate and irrevocable results of the war; that we approve the initial steps he has taken toward relaying the bonds of military authority in the Southern States, and in restoring to their people full and complete control over their local affairs just as soon as may be found compatible with the preservation of order, the maintenance of peace, the exclusion of slavery, and the fulfilment of the constitutional obligations of the national authority to guarantee to every State a republican form of government; and that we confidently look forward, under his wise and patriotic administration, to the establishment of more cordial relations, of greater mutual respect, and of a stronger interest in each other's welfare between the Northern and Southern sections of the Union than have hitherto prevailed, and that in all the measures he may adopt tending to the attainment of these just and beneficent ends, we pledge him our cordial and hearty support.

These—and other—resolutions were *unanimously* adopted.

CHURCH UNION—NORTH AND SOUTH.

[There is enough of truth in the following excerpts from an article in the still surviving *Journal of Commerce*, to warrant a reproduction here. What is said to and of the Methodist Church, applies with equal force to some other denominations. The political and commercial element in the popular religion is nearly all that remains. While Slavery continued, the Northern Church was one with the South mainly, until the Southern Methodists withdrew. But that did not absolve the Northern Conferences. For, while the separation was wholly the work of the South (the North opposing it), there was absolutely a border left in the Northern Conference, including several whole States, in which the number of slaveholding Methodists reached to thousands, and their slaves to tens of thousands. Hence the justice of some of the strictures in the *Journal of Commerce*, as given below:]

IT seems as if the leaders in the Northern Churches are hankering after the same sort of victory which Grant won over Lee. They want a surrender of the Southern churches. They insist upon a formal capitulation. Now this is worse than nonsense. It is a great and grave sin. We regret that it becomes necessary for a secular paper to administer the rebuke which the religious press ought to give to these church bodies.

In order that we may not be accused of misrepresentation we quote from the *Evangelist* a statement of the Northern Methodists. That paper says:

"Nothing more was to be asked from their Southern brethren as the condition of a cordial union, than that they should unequivocally declare their loyalty to the General Government and accept in good faith the fact that the servitude of the colored race had forever ceased."

This would seem to be very easy indeed, but not so easy after all when we remember the high and commanding position which the Church of Christ ought to take. The test of membership of that church is not a test of human politics. Imagine the soul of a man dying to-day in Alabama receiving at the bar in Heaven the reward of its deeds. If we understand the faith of the church, Protestant or Catholic, Methodist or Presbyterian, there will be no such question put to the soul of the Southerner as this: "Do you unequivocally declare your loyalty to the General Government of the United States?" If we have been correctly taught the doctrine of salvation by faith and works, or any other method of salvation, as held by any Christian Church, Unitarian or Trinitarian, there will be no such test applied at the gate of heaven as this.

What are these men, Methodists or Presbyterians, or what not, who dare attempt to bind on earth what God has not bound and will not bind in heaven? Is the Methodist Church North so much holier than Heaven itself, are its robes so much purer than the robes of those who walk in white, are its feasts so much better than the festal scenes at the Prince's own table, that they may make rules for the exclusion of associates here which He will not make there?

These men are making a grave error. The truth is that none of us and none of them, not a man of them, from bishop to the last convert at the last meeting, is fit to sit down at the table of the Church on High. If we should undertake to compare the fitness of Northern Christians with the fitness of Southern Christians to be church members, it would be found of both that the mercy of God alone could save them. No Pharisaical self-righteousness would avail either in the sight of a just judge. Humility becomes both classes. It is just possible that both may be saved. One class is quite as fit for church membership as the other. A comparison of Northern sins with Southern sins would show quite as much to be repented of by one race as by the other.

Selections.

AT THE RUBICON.

From the Chicago Tribune.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON has gone far enough to get his feet wet in a Rubicon which we hope he will not cross, for if he proceeds it will prove a Red Sea to him and his small host. *The plain question before him is whether he will cross over to the rebels, now called Southern Unionists, or keep faith with the Union men who elected him.* That there may be no doubt what we mean, we will state what acts will be regarded by the Union men generally as crossing over to the rebels.

1. Reorganizing the rebel armies of the various rebel States, under rebel officers, to preserve order between the freedmen and the white rebels who alone commit the disorder, thus substantially annulling Mr. Lincoln's emancipation policy.

2. Insisting that Southern rebels, as soon as they have asked President Johnson's pardon, stand on the same footing as Northern Unionists, and that their inchoate State organizations, as soon as they have called a convention and formed a constitution satisfactory to the President, are to be considered as full-fledged States, having all the rights of States, though not yet acknowledged as such by Congress; that our armies are to be withdrawn, while the late rebel armies are to reassemble and occupy their places, and that the freedmen are to have no rights and no protection in such States, more than these *quasi* State governments may enact.

3. Speaking and acting in a manner that plainly indicates that he regards those who elected him as fanatics and fools, whose views are "clamor" and whose utterances are "pestilent and malignant," while the support of the classes lately in rebellion, and their Northern sympathizers, are all he deems necessary to his administration.

These courses of action will speedily lead to such results as will demonstrate that, while in the United States a President has great powers, it is possible for him so to exercise them as to prove that they do not exceed those of the people. There is certainly no desire on the part of the Union party of the North to have any disagreement with the President whom they elected. If such disagreement arise it will be his fault, not theirs. But if he expects that our four years of war are to have no other effect than to restore to power the elements which constituted the late rebellion, *then a disagreement between him and his party is inevitable. That which crushed out the rebellion can hardly quail before a single man—though he be Andrew Johnson.*

There is nothing in the political situation to tempt President Johnson into the great error of forsaking the support of his party in order to coalesce with the miserable wind-broken rump of the Northern Copperhead politicians, who despise him, and whom he has every reason to despise, and the still more fatally used up rebels of the South, whose ideas can no more be expected to rule this country again than the Atlantic Cable can be resurrected from its ocean depths. Yet they are cuddling him with honeyed words of harlot love, as if they hoped, like the Philistines, to find out the secret of his strength, and anon to present him to the world a shorn, blind Sampson. The secret of his strength lies in the confidence of the Union party. Cut that off and they have indeed triumphed.

On the other hand let that remain unimpaired, let President Johnson appreciate the ideas which formed the Union party, which underlay the last four years' war, which crowned Abraham Lincoln with an immortality of fame, and gave liberty to four millions of an oppressed race, and let him move on to complete universal liberty in universal suffrage, and he will find that Mr. Lincoln left a full half of the great harvest of fame standing for his successor.

A true sagacity, even with regard only to his own fame and the success of his administration could dictate but one course to President Johnson, viz.: to make himself the standard-bearer of the American people on the question of Universal Suffrage, as Abraham Lincoln did on the question of Emancipation. If he pursue any other course it is because his sagacity is not equal to his opportunities.

PROVISIONAL GOV. PERRY'S MESSAGE.

From the N. Y. Tribune.

AT a moment when the public eye is anxiously scrutinizing the reconstruction experiment of the President, it is unfortunate for the success of that experiment that Provisional Gov. Perry, of South Carolina, should have published a message, the tone of which is little in accordance with the reasonable expectations of the loyal North. No one, we venture to say, will regret it more than President Johnson. It is scarcely in good taste, to say the least, for a just pardoned Governor addressing a half-pardoned Convention to cast an imputation on the purposes of the loyal States, and to arraign a great party dominant in those States for its views on national policy. Gov. Perry thinks it necessary to assure his Convention that the President will oppose the centralization of power in Congress, and the infringement of the constitutional rights of the States. Who proposes to centralize power or infringe any rights of the States? We know of no party or individual advocating such a policy; but we presume Gov. Perry intends us to understand that it is the "Radical Republican party North" which is thus guilty, since he subsequently reproaches that party with an effort to interfere with the suffrage question. But, "*You*," says Gov. Perry to his Convention, "will settle this grave question as the interest and honor of the *State* demand." Those who wish well to the President's policy will be the first to deplore that one of his Governors should thus forget that in the reconstruction of the Union, *all* the States have an interest in the acts of each of the insurgent States, and that the latter are to come back on such terms, and with such a form of Government, as shall tend to assure the future stability and perpetuity of the Union which they have vainly sought to break in pieces.

Gov. Perry goes out of his way to exhume the Dred Scott decision for the sake of a fling at the Republican party. "They forget," he says of that party, "that this is a white man's Government, and intended for white men only; and that the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the negro is not an American citizen under the Federal Constitution." We may be excused for forgetting what we never knew. It was not a white man's Government when Thomas Jefferson and the American Congress immortalized themselves by declaring that *all* men are created equal. It was not a white man's Government during the last three years when it found refuge against white traitors behind two hundred thousand black bayonets. Nor did the Supreme Court ever decide that the negro is not a citizen. There is, though not a decision of the Court nor an opinion of the Chief Justice, a dictum of one Roger B. Taney—since gone to his reward—that negroes have no rights which white men are bound to respect; but six Supreme Courts could not make that infamous doctrine law to-day. The difficulty with Gov. Perry is, he wants to put the clock four years back. We assure him it is impossible. We assure him in all kindness that South Carolina must present herself at the doors of the House next December with words quite other than his on her repentant lips, if she looks to see those doors fly open to her delegation. It is hardly worth while, it is hardly good policy, to couch a petition in words that are an insult to the party which is to grant the petition, or to reject it at its discretion.

Again, Gov. Perry recognizes in express terms that Slavery is abolished and that the Convention must accept abolition as a finality. Yet in his next paragraph we find legislation recommended to prevent the "confusion, idleness, and dissatisfaction" which "so great and sudden a change" must produce, and "to regulate the relative duties of the employer and employé." Coupled with this is the holding out of a prospect that the negroes will soon be deprived of the protection of the United States troops. The two suggestions together mean simply that Gov. Perry expects to establish a system of compulsory labor that will reduce the "employé" to something like serfdom, while the legislation affecting the "employer" will never be of a kind to embarrass his control over the negroes. We must assure Gov. Perry that this is no more calculated than the other to smooth the way of his State back into the Union.

We can scarcely believe it is true, as Gov. Perry states, that the colored troops have been removed at his instance from the interior of the State. Whether that be so or not, there is no shadow of excuse for his assertion that "the atrocious conduct of the colored troops has disgraced the service and filled the public mind with the most horrible apprehensions." He alleges no fact in support of this tremendous accusation. There is none to allege. The imputation is a cruel slander on loyal and orderly troops.

There are portions of this message which invite commendation rather than criticism. It contains many sensible propositions concerning State affairs. If it contained as many on matters national we should augur more hopefully of the doings of the Convention to which it is addressed.

JOHN STUART MILL ON NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

To the Editor of The Commercial:

SIR: Some weeks since the eminent foreign name of *De Tocqueville* was brought into service in behalf of the argument against universal suffrage. Opportunity was given for this in his very unsatisfactory chapter on slavery; unsatisfactory, because while he labors at great length upon the difficulties attending the Southern problem of races, he yet attempts no solution of it; and closes what he has to say with unavailing reproaches against those who introduced slavery upon this continent, and in the language of despair.

In this connection, it occurred to me that the views on this subject of the still more eminent foreigner, John Stuart Mill, would be of great service. I therefore wrote him, enclosing Gen. Cox's Oberlin letter, with my reply to it, and requested his opinion on the question of negro suffrage, which was the question considered in those letters. I inclose herewith his reply, a most luminous exposition, in brief terms, of the whole subject. Let those who read it remember that this is not the language of the philosopher and statesman merely, but of our constant friend, who has the advantage, by reason of his foreign position, of seeing our affairs in somewhat the same light in which they will be viewed by posterity. Respectfully, yours,

W. M. DICKSON.

Cincinnati, Sept. 19, 1865.

BLACKHEATH PARK, Kent, Sept. 1, 1865.

DEAR SIR: I am sincerely obliged to you for giving me an opportunity of reading the letter of Gen. Cox, and your excellent paper in reply.

You ask me for an opinion. I should hesitate very long before obtruding upon any American, and still more upon the American public, any mere opinion of mine respecting their internal concerns. But it is the concern of all mankind, almost as much as of the United States, that the conquests achieved by your great and arduous struggle should not be, in the very hour of victory, carelessly flung away; and the opinion which you do me the honor to ask is one which I share with so many of the noblest and wisest Americans, that I need have the less scruple in expressing it.

It is certainly some gain to the negroes, and to the principle of freedom, that they have been made even nominally free. I do not pretend that it is nothing that they can no longer legally be bought and sold. But this is about the amount of all they have gained, if the power of legislation over them is handed over once more to their old masters, and to the mean whites by whom they are despised as much, and probably more, than even by their masters, and who have been fighting these four years to retain them enslaved. If it were not for your State institutions, the case would not be so pressing; for those who have made them free could keep them so.

But, once the war-power laid down, and the regular course of State government restored, what is to prevent a State Legislature, chosen by their enemies, from making laws under which, unless they resist by force, they will have as little the control of their own actions, as little protection for life, honor, and property—will, in short, be, except in a few of the outward incidents of slavery, almost as much slaves—as before? To bring this about, it would not even be necessary to enact new laws. It would suffice to leave the old ones unrepealed, by which the testimony of a negro cannot be received against a white. Nay, even were these laws abrogated, nothing more would be needed than partiality and prejudice in the white courts of justice.

And would it be consistent with ordinary human nature that such partiality and prejudice should not exist? All this is so evident, that even the candidate to whose letter you so ably replied is quite aware of it, and can suggest no means of averting the evil, except what I agree with you in regarding as the chimerical project of effecting a local separation between the two races, excluding the negroes from the jurisdiction of the States and giving them a territorial government apart. It is not to be believed that the President or Congress will entertain such a scheme as this seriously. If, then, they allow the Southern States to reorganize themselves, and resume all their constitutional rights without negro suffrage, what is to be done?

To abandon the negroes to the tender mercies of those from whom, at so terrible a cost, you have so lately rescued them? No party or set of men in the Free States are so shameless as to propose this combined turpitude and imbecility. But the freedom of the negroes and the self-government of the Southern States, as at present constituted, cannot co-exist, and if it is determined that, come what will, the former shall be a reality, it must be intended that the latter should be a mere pretence. A censorship will have to be exercised over all the acts, both legislative and administrative, of the State governments; the Federal authorities will, by military coercion, prevent or set aside all proceedings calculated to interfere with that equality of civil rights which they are bound by every consideration, both of duty and of interest, to secure to the freed race. And this military dictatorship will have to be continued for a very great length of time; for it is speaking within bounds to say that two generations must elapse before the habits and feelings engendered by slavery give place to new ones—before the stain which the position of slave-master burns into the very souls of the privileged population can be expected to fade out.

This is the state of things which the policy now apparently acted on by the Federal Government leads to; but I have too high an opinion of the intentions and feelings of the President, and the practical good sense and determination of the American people, to believe that such a policy will be persevered in. It would be nothing less than electing to rule tyrannically over the whole Southern population, in order to avoid depriving the white half of that population of the power of tyrannizing over the black half.

Instead of restoring to the States lately in rebellion a nominal self-government which, unless you are willing to sacrifice all that has been gained by four years of civil war, cannot be suffered to be real, would it not be better to make the self-government real, but to grant it only to a mixed community, in which the population who have been corrupted by vicious institutions will be neutralized by black citizens and white immigrants from the North?

And what is the hinderance to this in the minds of the President and his Cabinet? Is it scruples about legality? To be scrupulous about exceeding his lawful powers, well becomes the first magistrate of a free people. But in this case the scruple seems wholly out of place. We are told that the Rebel States must be assumed never to have been out of the Union, and therefore to be unconditionally entitled to all their original liberties and powers the moment they condescend to accept them. Reason would say, on the contrary, that by declaring themselves independent of the Union they could not, indeed, divest themselves of its obligations, but certainly forfeited its privileges. A state of civil war suspends all legal rights and all social compacts between the combatants. Except under the terms of a capitulation, defeated rebels have no rights but the universal ones of humanity.

The Southern people, their lives, bodies, and estates, were, by the issues of the war, placed at the discretion of their conquerors; but of conquerors whom both the general law of right, and the special principles of their own social and political institutions, forbid to exercise permanent dominion over any human beings as subjects, or on any other footing than that of equal citizenship. It would, however, be on the part of the free States a generosity partaking of silliness were they to give back to their bitter enemies not only power to govern themselves and the negroes within their limits, but (through representatives in Congress) to govern the free States too, without first exacting such changes in the structure of Southern society as will render such a relation between them and the free States rational and safe. If you have not a right to do this, you had not a right to impose the abolition of slavery.

Consider what an element you are going once more to admit into the supreme Government of the Union. Think of this one thing—it is but one of many. Every Southern member of Congress elected without negro suffrage is a sure vote for that blackest and most disgraceful breach of faith which would brand American Democracy and popular government itself with a mark that would endure for generations—the repudiation of the war debt. The Southern representatives, in fact, would be the only members of Congress who could honestly vote for this, since, to their minds, unless the Confederate debt is recognized too, it would seem only equal justice. This is of itself a sufficient reason why no community composed exclusively or principally of those who have been engaged in the rebellion is fit to have a voice in Congress.

Of course, the States have to be readmitted; to keep them out and govern them as subjects would be in contradiction to all the principles of the American or any other free Constitution. But the future history of America, perhaps for ages to come, depends (I cannot but think) upon your requiring them, before admission, to give guarantees to freedom, by admixture with fellow-citizens whose interests and feelings are in unison with justice, and with the principles of the free States. Migration from the North will do this in time and in part, but only negro suffrage can do it sufficiently.

I have no objection to requiring, as a condition of the suffrage, education up to the point of reading and writing; but upon condition that this shall be required equally from the whites. The poor whites of the South are understood to need education quite as much as the negroes, and are certainly quite as unfit for the exercise of the suffrage without it. I am, dear sir, yours, very sincerely,

J. S. MILL.

Hon. Judge Dickson, etc.

NEW YORK COWARDICE.

From the Chicago Tribune.

WE never turn our eyes eastward to contemplate the attitude of New York Republican politicians without sincerely praying with the Psalmist, "Lord hold up the weak hands and strengthen the feeble knees." The Union party of New York believes with substantial unanimity in extending the right of suffrage, under some proper limitations, to the black race. They know that the plan of reconstruction adopted by President Johnson not only deprives the negro race of this right, but gives to the vote of South Carolina three times the electing power that attaches to a New Yorker's vote. They believe that it is imperfect, unsafe, and wrong. Their presses, the *Times*, *Tribune*, and *Post* have mildly proven as much. Even their adverse journals, the unstable *Herald*, the Copperhead *World*, and rebel *News* have at times conceded the justice of negro suffrage. They know that Andrew Johnson's Mississippi policy, if carried out, will disgrace the Republican party morally and overthrow it politically, yet they hesitate and tremble before the President like Louis the XVI. in the hands of his tormentors, half ratifying the measures that are to dethrone them. The New York *Tribune* even denies the charge that President Johnson's policy is directed against the Republican party; and while it gives just enough of squeak to show that it is being trod upon, dares not strike at the aggressor. The *Times* is as obsequious as the President's doorkeeper. The *Evening Post* is overwhelmed with admiration at the "magnanimity" of turning over the black race after it has helped us to save the Union, to the tender mercies of the white rebels who so nearly destroyed it.

Thurlow Weed is working to lead off as many of the Republican party as possible into Copperheadism under pretence of catering to an imagined Copperheadism which only exists in the Republican party so far as he creates it. Meanwhile the common people look on wondering what large element of knavery there is in the principles of the Republican party which makes the leaders so ashamed to avow them.

The New York Republicans cannot long walk with this cat-like step and secretive air without being set down for knaves of some kind. They have principles—none nobler than that of equal rights to all men without distinction of race or color. The shrewder Democractic politicians of the State would leap to place a principle so popular as "universal suffrage" in their platforms, if they could do it without alienating the white Democratic vote of the South, thus losing more than they could possibly gain. The principle, if triumphant, will be worth in ten years six hundred thousand votes to the party that adopts it. Its repudiation by the Republican party, when the logic of events has flung it like a priceless pearl at their feet, would be eternal ruin. No political party can survive the repudiation of a principle so inherently Democratic as negro suffrage.

Let the Republican party of New York forget a part of its superfluous cunning, and supply its place with square-toed, perpendicular honesty. Let them avow their principles, whether they chime with those of the Tennessee Democrat in the Presidental chair or not, since to attempt to conceal them is as ridiculous as for the ostrich when pursued to stick its head in the sand, while itself alone is oblivious of the additional elevation and prominence it thereby gives to its posterior. Let them act no more the part of court puppets, but that of men (perhaps they may have heard of such) "who know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain."

CONCILIATION.

From the N. Y. Times.

THE BEECHES, Tuesday, Sept. 12, 1865.

To a "Georgian"—

SIR: In your communication, published in the *Times* of the 9th inst., there is so much of courtesy, of good feeling, and of apparent regard for the welfare of the country, that for these qualities you command my respect. Your plea for "conciliation" is addressed to the people. It were not needed by the Government; for how any mortal can ask more *conciliations* to rebels than the Government manifests, is beyond my power of conceiving. For aught I can see, every rebel in the South, who was not killed or wounded in the war, will return to all his social, political, and financial rights, just as if he had never been a rebel. The plumed rebel is to return, like the hawk after his descent on the farm-yard, driven off by a fighting cock, with his talons yet bloody, his beak yet sharp, his wings yet plumed, sitting on a tree, prepared for another plunge into the farm-yard. Henry A. Wise (that perpetual nuisance) wants back his plantation; Wade Hampton issues his proclamation from the mines of Columbia; Robert E. Lee takes the Presidency of a college, where he may teach the same sort of loyalty which carried a rebel army into Maryland and Pennsylvania!

The barbarous soldiery of Mississippi (who, I think, even a "Georgian" will admit to be barbarous) are to be reorganized as a "State Militia!" If this is not "conciliation" I marvel what can be. I need not say, I do not agree with any part of this policy. If it had been left to me, I should have put these gentlemen where they would have little power to preach or practice treason. Your plea for conciliation is, therefore, not addressed to the Government, but to such persons as I am; and, in reply, I beg leave to make a few suggestions. Many things you speak of are out of the question. 1. There is no question of suffrage in dispute, for the Government has determined that the rebels (on taking the oath, which you say they will keep) may vote, and that no effort shall be made to enforce negro suffrage. Moreover, I am not aware that any organized body in the United States are attempting to enforce negro suffrage on any of the rebel States. There are a large number of people, like myself, who intend to enforce the equality of human r

2. If the rebel States return to the Union, they must return with all of their so-called State Rights; so there will be no reason to complain on that score. They will do more; they will have made a large political capital (seventeen members of Congress) more than they had four years ago; and in my opinion they will use that capital as Mr. Henry A. Wise and Mr. Wade Hampton and other equally honorable heroes of the rebellion propose, to make war on the Government, by votes, when they can no longer do it by bayonets. But before that is done, perhaps the Congress of the United States will be allowed to say something on the subject.

3. In regard to what may be called personal bitterness, or triumphs over fallen foes, I join with you in utter condemnation of it. It is unchristian and ungentlemanly, and I don't think you will find any civil or Christian American to trouble you with anything of the sort; but what I agree in is this: I take a totally different view from what the Administration seems to do. A *conciliation* which leaves criminals unrepenting, unpunished, and fully armed and equipped for any future crime, seems to me unjustified by anything which history has exhibited of the character and conduct of human nature. But I leave this question. The Government may yet find that when the petted tiger springs, his benefactor will be the first to suffer.

4. I ask, on your theory, Mr. "Georgian," what is to be the future? The argument *ad personam*, may be uncivil, but it is often very forcible. You have given us a chapter in your own history, and I wish to make an application of it. You say:

"I entered into this revolution voluntarily; I voted for John Bell and Edward Everett; when Mr. Lincoln was elected I become a Secessionist; I am disabled for life by a wound, but I am sick of strife; with the rest of my countrymen I desire a lasting peace, and the glory of the Government under which we live."

That is, you were a Whig and a Conservative, believing that the constitution and the laws ought to be enforced; yet no sooner was Lincoln elected, legally and constitutionally, as all preceding Presidents had been, than you instantly become a "Revolutionist," a "Secessionist," a warrior on the field of bloody rebellion, never ceasing your efforts to destroy the Government of your country till you were struck down in battle! Can you imagine a moral and intellectual perversion of the human mind greater than that? Can you be certain that you will not do the same thing again, when it suits your passions or your interests? Can you be certain that millions in the South are not ready to do the same thing, under the same circumstances? Where, then, is the security for the future? Is it so very unkind to doubt the "oaths" of those who could so suddenly throw off every obligation due to their country? You say you are tired of "strife." Really, I cannot wonder at it. Was there ever man, who "voluntarily" went into battle, got whipped, wounded, and disabled, who was not tired of strife? I hope that your peaceful disposition may extend over all your brethren in the South, and your future be as pleasant as your experience has been salutary.

A VETERAN OBSERVER.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1865.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY DISTINCTION IN CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES AMONG THE NATURALIZED CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES RESIDING WITHIN ITS LIMITS, OR AMONG PERSONS BORN ON ITS SOIL OF PARENTS PERMANENTLY RESIDENT THERE, ON ACCOUNT OF RACE, COLOR, OR DESCENT.

ANNUAL MEETING.—The Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society will be held in Horticultural Hall, West Chester, October 27th, day and evening. A more particular notice hereafter. JAMES MOTT, President.
BENJAMIN C. BACON, Cor. Secretary.

THE STANDARD Subscribers to whom bills are sent, will confer a favor by remitting the amounts due at their earliest convenience.

THE SYRACUSE SURRENDER.

WHILE we share in the regret which Anti-Slavery men in general feel at the surrender of the Republicans at Syracuse, we are by no means sure that the case would have been much altered for the better had the Radical wing of the party been able to get possession of the Convention. In a political point of view, and for the purposes of the State canvass, the Republicans have probably gained by the ascendancy of the Weed faction. They have indeed abandoned their principles, but they have secured an independent nomination. If the Radical programme had been carried out, it is certain they would have lost their candidates, and it is not certain they would have saved their principles. Mr. Greeley and his friends were quite ready to adopt the main part of the Democratic ticket rather than risk a defeat at the polls. As an offset, they would have presented resolutions endorsing President Johnson a little less unreservedly, and hinting at negro suffrage with a little less circumlocution. But in neither case would the real distrust of the President and the genuine faith in universal suffrage which pervade the party have been allowed an expression. Syracuse was destined to afford one more illustration of the radical weakness of the Radical wing of the Republicans.

We concern ourselves with this party conflict because its consequences are momentous to the Anti-Slavery cause. New York might have done much toward saving the nation; she has shrunk from the task. The Republican party, to which alone among political organizations we can look with any hope at this hour, stands at the turning of two ways. Its Conventions have gone groping about over the country, resolving one thing in Pennsylvania and another in Massachusetts; declaring for negro suffrage in Minnesota and against it in Wisconsin; and in Ohio shirking the whole question till its candidate stepped boldly on to a platform much more rotten than the Convention itself had ventured to construct. Out of this chaos of conflicting opinions, it was reserved for New York to evoke order. The Empire State, with its vast political influence, might probably have dictated a policy—expressing no more than the average sentiment of the North—that should have bound the Republican States again together, and declared to the President that the party which elected him demanded from him fidelity to its principles. The opportunity has been lost, and the country again drifts blindly on toward the Niagara which invites the fatal plunge.

Mr. Greeley says the Radicals had a majority of fifty in the Convention, but were out-generalled for want of a leader. We presume both statements are true, but what a commentary on the Radicals and their leader! It is a sort of apology that leaves the case worse than it found it. Nor does such a statement tell the whole truth. The real explanation of this holocaust of the Radical wing is that they preferred to see their principles sunk out of sight and themselves divided rather than risk a contest in a Convention where they out numbered their opponents two to one. They could not afford to have a "split" in the party. They had tried that in 1862. Mr. Weed had been affronted by the nomination of Gen. Wadsworth, and in revenge sold out the election. The Radicals knew he would do it again, if provoked as before. Pity they did not provoke him. In our judgment, defeat with Wadsworth was better than success with Dix; for the nomination involved at that time the integrity of the party. So would it have been now had the Radicals stood by their colors, put up their own men, and boldly avowed their principles.

The platform has been described as timid. It is anything but timid. It notifies the majority of the party that it is expected to yield to the minority. We assume it as a fact not to be disputed that the majority of the Republicans cordially disapprove the President's plan of reconstruction. They are committed by these resolutions to an unqualified endorsement of it. While the Republicans may still doubt whether Andrew Johnson means to desert them or not, a resolution of formal compliment to him, which is the usage of Conventions, would have excited no surprise and little dissent. But these resolutions "approve as eminently wise and just the sentiments of kindness and confidence which President Johnson has evinced toward" the communities lately in rebellion, which have repented—meaning thereby to endorse and approve that shameless speech last week to the Southern delegation at Washington. They approve expressly "the initial steps he has taken toward relaxing the bonds of military authority in the Southern States, and in restoring to their people full and complete control over their local affairs as soon as may be found compatible with the preservation of order," etc. The President were unreasonable indeed, if he desired a more complete abasement of the party at his feet than that. Between this and the support which the Democrats offer him, we can detect no essential difference. On the question of principle, the only distinction is that the Democrats boldly avow themselves opposed to negro suffrage, while the Republicans refuse to say they are for it. The practical effect is the same. The resolutions of the Democrats represent their settled purpose to Tylerize the President. The resolutions of the Republicans reflect nothing but their coward fear to break with a President who is openly coquetting with their opponents, and secretly plotting to betray either of them, as shall prove most advantageous for himself.

The Republicans affect to doubt whether President Johnson has any purpose to abandon his party. Senator Wilson says in a recent speech in Philadelphia, that he put him the question—of course in a decorous form—whether the Radicals were to have the cold shoulder at the White House on account of their opinions. With rare magnanimity, the President assured him that the Radicals were at perfect liberty to maintain their own views as long as they allowed him full swing in his policy in the opposite direction! Singular liberality! This President, the offspring of an accident, elevated to a position incomparably higher than the country or his party would have voluntarily bestowed on him, assures a leading representative of the party that he shall not turn them all out of office because they adhere to the principles which he abandons! And Senator Wilson repeats the swan-song of the Conservatives that the present policy is only an experiment. Mr. Wilson is a good witness, but the President is a better; and he expressed his opinion on that point in the telegram to Gen. Schurz, revoking his original instruction to examine into the working of an "experiment," and directing him to give all his efforts to supporting the Sharkey scheme of reconstruction. And we add to that the recent testimony of a Senator not less distinguished than Mr. Wilson, that the President, although inclined to experiment at first, had grown wedded to his scheme, and so confident of its success that he would brook no opposition. Mr. Seward—we have the same authority for it—pronounces the present Reconstruction scheme the best specimen of statesmanship and the most perfect success the world ever saw! Yet this same Senator, with this information on his lips, avows his belief that it is unsafe to make negro suffrage an issue at present—which is the precise position of Mr. Forney, and the semi-official announcement of the court journals, the Philadelphia *Press* and the Washington *Chronicle*. "The party can't afford to be beaten in the Fall elections. Wait till Congress meets and make the struggle there. *Then* it may be necessary to break with the President."

It is a blind counsel, unworthy of a statesman, discreditable even to a politician. We have had our Republican Conventions, New York the last of them. They have done their worst to prostrate the country and the party. Victorious or defeated in the elections, it matters little, since no principle is at stake. If victorious, we shall be told the country has sustained the President by electing the candidates standing on a platform of which he is the real architect. If defeated, the cry will be that the Democrats have carried the country because they endorsed the President. It is the gambler's trick, "heads I win, and tails you lose." What is to be hoped from a Congress that has looked on while that game was playing? You cannot have a Congress unless you have a country behind it. The Senator whom we have quoted, and the Radicals of New York, who, like him, were unwilling to risk a split, may find—God grant we be mistaken—that in their effort to postpone the struggle they have destroyed their sole chance of success, and that the Congress on which they relied to resist the President has been demoralized in advance by the weakness and timidity of its leaders.

MR. MILL'S LETTER.

WE print herewith a notable letter from John Stuart Mill on Negro Suffrage and other problems of Reconstruction. Its first merit is that it is not a volunteer statement, but is in answer to a request by Judge Dickson, of Ohio, who sent Mr. Mill a copy of Gen. Cox's colonization and anti-suffrage pronunciamento, asking his opinion on it. Mr. Mill doesn't pay much attention to Gen. Cox, but states his own views with admirable vigor and clearness. It is seldom that an Englishman's opinion on American topics is valuable; Mr. Mill's is, because he writes of what he understands. Mr. Bright excepted, he is almost the only one of our English friends who can touch the complex machinery of Federal and State administration with a competent hand. It is no slight recommendation that even Mr. Mill does it with unaffected modesty. "I should hesitate very long before obtruding upon any American, and still more upon the American public, any mere opinion of mine respecting their internal concerns. But it is the concern of all mankind almost as much as of the United States, that the conquests achieved by your great and arduous struggle should not be, in the very hour of victory, carelessly flung away."

It is necessary to say that in a single particular Mr. Mill shows himself mistaken. He believes there is no party or set of men in the Free States so shameless as to propose to abandon the negroes to the tender mercies of those from whom, at so terrible a cost, we have lately rescued them—an abandonment he justly characterizes as a "combined turpitude and imbecility." Unhappily, there is such a party. The hostility of the Sham Democracy to Negro Suffrage is exactly the same and inspired by the same motives as their hostility to Emancipation. They resisted the latter as long as resistance was possible, and as long as it is possible they will struggle to make Emancipation a fraud and Freedom a sham. They see, just as clearly as Mr. Mill sees, that to give the slaves freedom and nothing more, is to deny them "control of their own actions, and protection for life, honor, and property," and to leave them "except in a few outward incidents of Slavery, almost as much slaves as before." That is precisely what the Democratic party, meaning now as before to ally itself with the aristocratic minority of the South, desires to bring about. Possibly we ought not to regret that an Englishman should deem any party in America incapable of a purpose so inhuman and unstatesmanlike. Yet that is the party whose support the President is seeking to conciliate, and the policy which Mr. Mill indignantly denounces is the President's own policy, endorsed and supported not only by the Democrats but by a large section of the Republican party.

We do not agree with Mr. Mill that what is called "intelligence," the ability to read and write, etc., can justly be made a test for the elective franchise, even though it be applied equally to the whites and blacks. We believe in universal suffrage, and if we did not we should insist that the blacks by their unflinching loyalty had earned the right to vote, and that on their voting depends the security of a free Union and the only possible establishment of a republican form of government.

A BLUNDER.—A devout and probably a Divine defender of negro hatred and proscription asks in our pro-slavery department with great self-complacency, "How is it that the framers of the Constitution never dreamed that it contains such a demand (Colored Suffrage)? How is it that this right was not discovered half a century ago?" The answer is, that at the adoption of the Constitution, and years afterward, South Carolina was the only State in the Union that had a color distinction on the right of suffrage. The "discovery" that it was *not* a right, is of a later date.

A HOUSE DIVIDED, AND WHO DID IT.

FOR half a century the Methodist Church of the country was one. It was betraying, denying, and crucifying humanity, by breeding, buying, and selling it in the person of its own baptized children and brethren. Selling it to be held in chattel slavery; to be leased, mortgaged, speculated in, or gambled away, as goods and chattels. Between 1830 and 1840 the anti-slavery movement was shaking not only the political earth, but the ecclesiastical heaven, as with the earthquake and whirlwind of Mount Horeb. Between 1840 and 1845 occurred the first act of secession. It was in the Methodist General Conference, the most stupendous power, perhaps, in the land, excepting the Federal Government itself. It should have been more potent than all earthly principalities. Its faithful rebuke and warning should have led the Government to repentance and righteousness, and the slaves to freedom and all its sublime enjoyments. Its half million of baptized communicants, led by more than ten thousand consecrated priests, elders, and bishops, should have compassed our Jerichos and Juggernauts with peal of God's eternal demand, "*Let my people go,*" until the demand was obeyed, or the prison walls stove down, so that the slave could leap to liberty over the ruins.

But the Methodist Church was a loyal as well as powerful part of the Government in the great idolatry. Some of her ministers, but more of her lay membership, both men and women, heard and obeyed the Divine command; and being full of faith and of the holy spirit of truth, they refused to bow before the gory god of slavery. The chief priests and rulers sought to silence them, and to compel them to obedience, but they would not hold their peace. Secession soon followed. At it many outside the Church were dismayed. Henry Clay bewailed it in Congress. He declared it presaged the fate and fall of the Union. And from that time, "*saving the Union*" became the one labor of many an aspiring political Hercules, in the vain hope of a triumphant apotheosis into the Presidency, as his exceeding great reward. But the fatal shirt of Nessus, rather than the ermine of Presidential honors, disappointed them all.

And the dread prediction of Mr. Clay was in due time fulfilled. The "still, small voice" of anti-slavery truth, omnipotent over all the slaveholding principalities and powers of the Government, and the spiritual wickedness in the high places of the Church, that sanctified its crimes and cruelties, and perpetrated them also at her own altars—that still, small voice was indeed made mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds. The Union, with almost all it contained, was smitten with the bolts of avenging wrath. Secession sundered the Methodist Conference; war dashed the Union in pieces.

And amid the ruins of empire, the scattered fragments of Southern Methodism have been picked up like the broken pottery of Pompeii. And the Northern General Conference made haste, on the cessation of arms, to invite back its long-lost sisterhood to the former love-feasts. The messengers flew like the patriarch's dove, with the olive-branch of peace and reconciliation. No Eurydice was ever more tenderly sought. No penitent prodigal was ever so entreated to return. We are assured by the *Methodist* that

"*The Southern bishops had offered to them an oblivion of the past, and the opportunity of entering upon a new life. They have preferred to flaunt their past, odious as it is to all true men, in our faces, and to glory in it as a badge of distinction.*"

It was even proposed to restore all to former fellowship that the Government would spare from the traitor's halter, and restore to citizenship!

But the South was and is incorrigible. The bishops have issued a stately address to their clergy, showing plainly that though Gen. Lee surrendered to Gen. Grant, and Jeff. Davis is a prisoner for whom many halters have been braided and sent to the Capitol; though the Confederacy has crumbled to the dust and been given to the winds; and the Federal arms, everywhere victorious, are mostly laid up in the arsenals, and those who bore them are at their homes; they still live, daring all human power, and ready for further battle. To their clergy they say:

"The condition of those Conferences and portions of our territory which have been the principal theatre of armies and battles will render the support of the ministry, for the present, at least, difficult. We beseech you, brethren, let no labor or sacrifice hinder you from preaching and hearing the Gospel. To accomplish this result your self-denials must be mutual and cheerful. The work of saving the souls of dying men, and of extending the Redeemer's kingdom, must go forward; our youth must be instructed, our Sabbaths hallowed, and our sanctuaries kept open. When and wherever necessary, we commend to the preachers the example of the apostle of the Gentiles in ministering to the Corinthians, 'working with his own hands.' * * * Have the days of a heroic and suffering ministry passed away? We trust not, but hope to see it illustrated in the opportunities the present distress affords. We cannot draw in our lines. We cannot abandon any field; but rather, in the spirit of our fathers, at once conservative and aggressive, while maintaining positions already taken, we must extend our labors to regions beyond."

The *Christian Advocate and Journal*, the organ of the Northern Conference, commenting on the address of the Southern bishops, very self-complacently says:

"We are at a loss whether more to admire the persistent unrepentance of these venerable men, or the facility with which they accept defeat, and their eagerness to conform themselves to their altered circumstances. The idea of any principle being involved in the late contest which must survive all political changes seems not to have entered their minds. * * * The abolition of slavery is viewed only in its political relations; its religious aspects are disregarded; and the fact that the Methodist Episcopal Church condemns slavery is, with them, a sufficient reason why reunion should not be thought of."

And once more, as between Northern and Southern:

"The antagonism of the two bodies is now more than recognized; it is asserted and insisted upon. The path of our duty is a very plain one."

And now for the object of this article. What is that "very plain path of duty?"

It is complained that the Southern Methodists "only view slavery in its *political* relations." They do not recognize "any principle involved."

When did the Northern Conference act on any higher grounds? Not surely till driven by Military Necessity, if ever. And then the Government abolished slavery, not the Conference. The Church did not banish slavery from its own most sacred altars. Government abolition was only partial and conditional; but the Northern Methodist Church seemed to regard it as actual and universal, and her own work, too. Both pretensions are false. The President's Proclamation was delayed to the last safe moment. In his first Inaugural Address he besought the seceded States to return, as tenderly as the Northern Methodists had sixteen years before entreated their Southern brethren not to leave them. The Proclamation left slavery unharmed in some whole States, and in large districts of others. The Methodist separation left eight annual Conferences in the North, the whole or a large part of whose territory was in slave States, and where were two or three thousand Methodist slaveholders, ministers, and members, still wielding the lash over twenty thousand slaves! Actual computation made the numbers even greater. Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas, most if not the whole of Kentucky, Delaware, and the greater part of Maryland and Virginia were of the Northern Conference before the necessities of war made them otherwise. What the Northern Methodist charges upon the South is true; but it is no less true of the accuser himself. He never abolished slavery in his Conference "from principle." He never abolished it at all. His Methodist Book of Discipline has been virtually a standing lie for fifty or eighty years. It says distinctly that "*the buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them,*" shall be held such an offence as that whoever shall be guilty of it "shall be admonished of the error of his way." We will bear with him for a season; but if then he repent not, he hath no more place among us. We have delivered our own souls!" This emphatic testimony against the abomination is old as Wesley, when not he alone, but Methodists generally, regarded slavery as the "*sum of all villanies,*" and the slaveholder of consequence, as the sum of all villains.

But in all these dreary years, Methodist slaveholding has been increasing, until the colored membership in the South reached two hundred and thirty thousand, myriads of whom, it used to be boasted by the South, were slaves who sat at the same communion tables with their masters.

Southern Methodist secession in 1844, and State secessios in 1860 and 1861, with the political and military necessities attendant on the war, have wrought the present purification, such as it is, of the Northern Methodist Church. There is no "principle" about it. It has never called on the Government to repent and put away slaveholding as an act of justice and a work of repentance and righteousness. It has never done these things for itself. The Government cannot be restored, because we are not willing to be just. "None calleth for justice!" We are willing, as a people, to give back the colored race to their former tormentors—slaves in all but the name. The President proves every day, more and more, not his *willingness* but his determination to push his pretended "experiment" to an unalterable policy. The Democratic party hastens to construct a platform to conform to it, knowing well with whom they treat. The easy virtue of the Republicans, sullied before in many an unclean bed, finds no difficulty in descending, if it be descent, to the same debasement. And now both parties are chanting doxologies in long metre to his *inflicted*, not elected Accidency, the President, and solemnly pledging to him a "cordial," "hearty," "energetic" support. Meanwhile he plunges on through State after State, with a policy of reconstruction, which, if it succeed, will kindle terrors and tribulations in both South and North unknown to them before.

The Methodist Conference North goes with the party of power, regardless of right. Its complaint of the Southern Methodists is, that they are "*hindering national reconstruction.*" It says through its great organ:

"The Southern Church—*if it thus continues to hinder national reconstruction*; if it continues, against the providence of God and the convictions of men, to try to shield the mighty iniquity of slavery under the sanctions of religion; *if it refuses to accept the fellowship of the Christian world and the olive-branch of peace—must perish as a Church, and be displaced.*"

We may pursue this subject still farther.

CROSS READINGS—OR WORSE

THE Norristown *Independent* had a polygonal editorial, last week, headed "Hon. Charles Sumner." The extracts below are specimens of its facts and logic. Representing the ideas of so many other Republican journals, they are deserving a moment's attention. Most of the newspapers, however, of all parties, unlike the *Independent*, admit that Mr. Sumner *has a plan*, real and practical, for reconstruction, and some of them approve it. It were undoubtedly well if they all did, and the people and Government with them. But who ever heard that Mr. Lincoln had any plan, or policy, or purpose, except to follow the guiding of events? Not even adopting *partial* emancipation (and that only conditional) until he had to write it in the blood of thousands upon thousands of brave men, vainly shed in attempts to restore the old heaven-accursed union with slavery and slaveholders!

And as to Andrew Johnson, he is, or claims to be, only trying political projects. His foes and friends say "*it is only an experiment!*" But it is an "*experiment*" upon the very life of justice itself! An "*experiment*" with the liberty, humanity, and happiness of a whole race of immortal beings; an "*experiment*" which is itself rebellion against the God of heaven. And yet the *Independent* "prates" solemnly about "God, who scourges us for our sins, and blesses and preserves us if we forgive, as we expect to be forgiven." Mr. Johnson according to the *Independent* has plans practical, real; Mr. Sumner has only "platitudes." Mr. Johnson seems desirous, at least is ready and willing to restore the old Union, with slavery in all but its name. He would give suffrage and citizenship to traitors black with the guilt of treason, red with the blood of half a million men, and withhold it from the colored man whose loyalty and patriotism are white and unsullied as the robes of heaven, and thus deliver him back to the tender mercies of his former tormentors. But to the article:

"Mr. Sumner speaks not like a high-toned, daring soldier, who would risk his life upon the field of battle for the sake of liberty and law, but like the sickly sentimentalist, who in time of quiet preaches distraction, and in times of war prates of peace." * * *

"The only danger ahead is precipitate action upon the part of Congress. If we could abolish the National Legislature for about four years, President Johnson and Mr. Seward would settle this trouble without a ripple upon the wave of national life. But Mr. Sumner comes forward with his studied orations and pleasing platitudes, intended to gratify his constituents and to make his tenure of office eternal—throwing obstacles in the way of adjustment, and suggesting nothing practical, nothing real—nothing but difficulty." * * *

"It is easy for politicians to talk. But the President of these United States must be above all politicians. He must not only govern this country with even-handed justice, but he must also turn a statesman's ear to the jealous diplomats of Foreign Powers." * * *

"Charles Sumner is one of the most learned, conscientious, and scrupulously correct men that ever went into the United States Senate. He has no stain upon his character. He has always been true to the sentiments of the people who elect him. Yet during the war he devised or originated no single plan for the settlement or the prosecution of the war. And now when the war is over he sees no way to heal the wound. For such work we must take *practical* men; just as we had to have plain, common, practical, ordinary men to conduct the war to a successful termination. Men of the type of Lincoln, Grant, Johnson, and Meade, are the kind to accomplish results. Such men as Sumner are the tribunes and oracles who make the nation known abroad for their learning, and in whose word we may read poetic truths and prophecies, and mutterings of coming storms. Sumner could not have governed this people during the four years from 1861 to 1865, when the lank, raw-boned, back-woods lawyer guided the ship of State safely and successfully through the wildest storm that ever rocked the mighty deep; and we must not fly away from Johnson to follow Sumner."

IN obedience to the demand of pardoned and unpardoned rebels, the President is withdrawing the colored troops from the Southern States, just as fast as he can do it without attracting too much attention and opposition from the North. Mr. Perry tells us they are already out of South Carolina; the President has himself directed their withdrawal from Mississippi; and even Gen. Terry has been compelled to order them out of Richmond. Their place will be supplied by the just disbanded rebel troops. Whether Lee is to be placed in command we have not yet heard.

A WHITE MAN'S GOVERNMENT.—The echo of President Johnson's recent declaration that "This is a white man's country, and, by God! while I am President it shall be a white man's Government," will be found in Provisional-Gov. Perry's message, which we copy in our Pro-Slavery column. Mr. Perry is at pains to say he has been in frequent consultation with the President; we may presume, therefore, that he only repeats what he heard at the White House.

WE have no space to comment on the important letters we publish this week from our regular correspondent in Louisiana, and from South Carolina. The outrages in the latter State and the spirit foreshadowed in Louisiana, may or may not attract the attention of the Government at present, but the longer we keep our eyes shut, the greater will be the danger.

STANDING BY HIS PARTY.—The President has ordered the Government advertising to be withdrawn from the Washington *Republican*, and has given it to the *Constitutional Union*, a copperhead paper of the bitterest and very lately of the most openly disloyal kind. Another measure of conciliation, we suppose.

WHILE wounded officers and soldiers on crutches hobble around the streets of Washington in search of employment, returned rebels are receiving appointments to Government offices. A few days since a rebel named Frank Minor, who left here at the breaking out of the rebellion and joined the fortunes of the Confederacy, was appointed to a clerkship in the Second Auditor's office; and it is reported that John Hart, formerly public printer, and for many years Washington correspondent of the Charlestown *Mercury*, has also received a snug berth in one of the departments. Hart has been living South during the war.

AT a public meeting held in Richmond last Saturday evening, Mr. Pendleton, one of the Congressional candidates who cannot swallow the test oath, said he thought it was a wretched policy on the part of the outside States —their existance depending on an early admission to the inside—to send to Washington a delegation whose chief qualification consisted in a readiness to submit to any terms a conqueror may impose.

OUR Philadelphia and Pennsylvania friends will find elsewhere an advertisement of the business of Wm. Still, a colored man, whom we cheerfully recommend to their patronage.

PERSONAL.

Ralph Waldo Emerson will probably deliver another series of Sunday evening lectures in Boston, by engagement with the Fraternity.

Provisional Gov. Perry announces that this is a white man's government. If so, remarks the Boston *Transcript*, what a pity it is that the Governor is not of a different color.

A Republican paper in Ohio states that Senator John Sherman, in his speech at Marietta, declared he would have said more about negro suffrage had not the State Central Committee (Rep.) at Columbus instructed him not to discuss the subject.

Wirz, now on trial for his treatment of prisoners at Andersonville, it is said has asked for and obtained a copy of Baxter's Call to the Unconverted. Would not the American Tract Society do well to publish a cheap edition of that justly celebrated work for general circulation at the South?

President Juarez writes to a friend that he has established his seat of government at El Paso, and that he will not leave the Mexican territory. He adds: "I do not despair of the success of our cause when I see the Mexicans everywhere resisting the yoke of the invader and maintaining the struggle in all our States."

The Philadelphia *North American* is delighted with the performances of "Blind Tom," the negro pianist, and says he is "a musical monster, a gigantic genius, doing at volition what ordinary men and women spend a lifetime of labor and study in attempting. It is a singular sensation to be brought into contact with this boy. You ask yourself, is he angel, man, or animal?" One of Tom's feats is to play with both hands, with his back towards the piano.

Among the rebels pardoned last week was Joseph R. Anderson, of the Richmond Tredegar Iron Works. His case was embarrassed by coming under three special exceptions. He is a graduate of West Point, was a general in the rebel service, and is worth over twenty thousand dollars. In consequence of Gov. Pierpoint's urgent recommendation the President gave the case more than ordinary consideration, and finally granted the pardon. It would be difficult to find a man who had rendered greater service to the Rebel cause. If he is pardoned, why should any pardon be refused? Is there any limit to the President's desire for "conciliation?"

The colleges of Virginia have fallen utterly into the hands of ex-traitors. The Virginia Military Institute, which gave Stonewall Jackson and many other officers to the rebel cause, has been revived, with Gen. G. A. Custis Lee, son of Robert E., Professor of Civil and Military Engineering and Applied Mechanics, and a number of rebel officers in other professorships. The Board of Visitors, who are appointed by Gov. Pierpoint, has among its number D. H. Strother and Wm. H. Richardson. The Institute is situated at Lexington, close by Washington College, over which, in the language of the Richmond *Times*, "the warrior Lee now presides."

A correspondent who is travelling down South, met the pirate Semmes, and thus describes him:

"Semmes, whom loyal men call 'pirate,' and rebels call 'admiral,' was on board, and I studied him closely to discover that noble, chivalric bearing which I have heard ascribed to him by those who used to be thrilled with rapture at his brave and gallant attacks upon unarmed whalers and merchantmen. I think this bearing must have entirely left him when the Kearsarge bore down on the Alabama. To me he looked like a repentant sinner who had sinned a long time before the work of repentance began. On the whole, he is a cheap, rheumy-looking man of about fifty-five years, the only expressive feature about him being his nose, which must have cost a great deal of money to bring to its present bright ruby color. He neither courted nor avoided observation, was travelling alone, and had little conversation with any one."

Mr. Seward gets the following notice from the Chicago *Tribune*, which, we dare say, he will be ungrateful enough not to like:

"Assistant Secretary Fox, in his report of the operations to relieve the garrison of Fort Sumter, in 1861, says that 'delays, which belong to the secret history of the period, prevented a decision until the afternoon of the 4th of April.' This allusion to secret history recalls the dispatch which Minister Harvey sent to the Charleston rebels, putting them on their guard against Capt. Fox's expedition, and undoubtedly impelling them to commence the bombardment before the expected relief could arrive. It is a part of 'the secret history of the period,' that when this dispatch of Harvey's was discovered, the Republican Senators held a caucus and appointed a committee to wait on the President and demand Mr. Harvey's recall from Portugal. When the committee reached the White House they ascertained that Mr. Harvey had acted with the knowledge and approval of Secretary Seward. Without more ado the valiant Senators trudged back to their places. According to their notions, what would be treasonable in a South Carolina newspaper correspondent was highly patriotic and commendable in a Secretary of State."

A Western paper describes the reception of Gen. Grant at St. Louis last week as a shabby and mortifying affair. The General's party, arriving at the levee, found it blocked up with tobacco drays, and nobody there even to show them the way to their hotel. His St. Louis entertainers thought to make amends for this shabby treatment by sending him one ticket to the banquet given to the English railroad gentlemen. Some of the General's Illinois friends, who were amazed at this boorishness, took pains to inquire into the cause of it, and were informed that the citizens of St. Louis were acting under the advice of Gen. Sherman, who had assured them that the proper way to receive Gen. Grant, and the way most consonant with his own feelings, would be to let him come and go quietly, and pay no attention to him.

The expedition of Professor Agassiz to Brazil promises most important results for science, particularly in the discovery of glaciers, and in the departments of mineralogy, geology, botany, ichthyology, and natural history generally. The glacial theories and investigations of Agassiz have contributed not a little to exalt his scientific reputation. His researches in the Alpine glaciers are embodied in two works, respectively published in 1840 and 1847, and a graphic description of his explorations was published at that time by one of his travelling companions. The results of the great naturalist's investigations in Brazil are expected with great interest, particularly as he had been familiarized with the natural history of that country at the time when he was still a student at the university of Munich, and when, after the death of Spix, one of the companions of Martius in the great scientific exploring expedition sent to Brazil under the auspices of the Austrian and Bavarian governments, Agassiz was appointed to succeed him in the elaboration of the ichthyological part of Martius' celebrated work on Brazil. The Emperor Don Pedro has placed a government steamer at the disposal of the professor for his explorations.

The *Athenæum* says of Sir Wm. Rowan Hamilton, who died Sept. 2:

"His namesake, of Scotland, who passed away nine years ago, was not more illustrious in his own pursuits. W. R. Hamilton became known as a mathematician of extraordinary genius when he was about twenty years old. There is no need to tell the mathematical world that it has lost one of its greatest members; we cannot enumerate for the world at large—most of the items are knowledge too high for them. His papers on systems of rays, on the methods of dynamics, on algebra looked at as the science of pure time, on discontinuous functions, on equations of the fifth degree, and his *new algebra*, the *Quaternions*, cannot be popularized. But there is one little result of which an idea can be given, one of the earliest of Hamilton's discoveries, and one which alone would carry down his name to posterity. Hamilton found, from optical theory alone, by reasoning on the properties of light, that under certain circumstances a ray, instead of being refracted as a ray, should, if the theory were true, split into a cone of rays. This *conical refraction*, on being looked for under the proper circumstances by Prof. Lloyd, was actually found to exist. No such phenomenon had ever been even imagined; and it may be justly said that no more remarkable triumph of theoretical prediction had then occurred in the history of science. If we must add to it, as a match, the prediction of Neptune by Leverrier and Adams, each of these brilliant feats does honor to the other. Sir W. R. Hamilton was a man of very wide pursuits, and very varied talents; he was a scholar, a metaphysician, and a poet.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, No. 1,112, contains "North Polar Explorations," "The Belton Estate, part 6," "Bible Study in the Fifteenth Century," "Cowper—New Life and new Edition," "Sismondi and Napoleon," "The Fleets at Cherbourg," and "Fast Life and High Life."

LITERARY.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1865. American Edition. Leonard Scott & Co.

This vigorous and varied number opens with an elaborate paper from the pen of John Stuart Mill on the "Later Speculations of Augusta Comte." Mr. Mill's survey extends over all the writings of the French philosopher except the Cours de Philosophie Positive, and presents in a compact and lucid form the best existing account of those writings. It is not a summary which will admit of abridgment, nor have we space for such extracts as might give a connected statement of the views which Mr. Mill has epitomized. But the article contains much of biographical and literary interest as well as philosophic. The following is a remarkable though not unique instance of intellectual independence:

"These various writings raise many points of interest regarding M. Comte's personal history, and some, not without philosophic bearings, respecting his mental habits; from all which matters we shall abstain, with the exception of two, which he himself proclaimed with great emphasis, and a knowledge of which is almost indispensable to an apprehension of the characteristic difference between his second career and his first. It should be known that, during his later life, and even before completing his first great treatise, M. Comte adopted a rule, to which he very rarely made any exception: to abstain systematically, not only from newspapers or periodical publications, even scientific, but from all reading whatever, except a few favorite poets, in the ancient and modern European languages. This abstinence he practiced for the sake of mental health; by way, as he said, of "*hygiène cérébrale.*" We are far from thinking that the practice has nothing whatever to recommend it. For most thinkers, doubtless, it would be a very unwise one; but we will not affirm that it may not sometimes be advantageous to a mind of the peculiar quality of M. Comte's—one that can usefully devote itself to following out to the remotest developments a particular line of meditations, of so arduous a kind that the complete concentration of the intellect upon its own thoughts is almost a necessary condition of success. When a mind of this character has laboriously and conscientiously laid in beforehand, as M. Comte had done, an ample stock of materials, he may be justified in thinking that he will contribute most to the mental wealth of mankind by occupying himself solely in working upon these, without distracting his attention by continually taking in more matter, or keeping a communication open with other independent intellects. The practice, therefore, may be legitimate; but no one should adopt it without being aware of what he loses by it. He must resign the pretension of arriving at the whole truth on the subject, whatever it be, of his meditations. * * *

"Neither is such a practice, in a hygienic point of view, free from the gravest dangers to the philosopher's own mind. When once he has persuaded himself that he can work out the final truth on any subject, exclusively from his own sources, he is apt to lose all measure or standard by which to be apprised when he is departing from ocmmon sense. Living only with his own thoughts, he gradually forgets the aspect they present to minds of a different mould from his own; he looks at his conclusions only from the point of view which suggested them, and from which they naturally appear perfect; and every consideration which from other points of view might present itself either as an objection or as a necessary modification, is to him as if it did not exist. When his merits come to be recognized and appreciated, and especially if he obtains disciples, the intellectual infirmity soon becomes complicated with a moral one. The natural result of the position is a gigantic self-confidence, not to say self-conceit. That of M. Comte is colossal. Except here and there in an entirely self-taught thinker, who has no high standard with which to compare himself, we have met with nothing approaching to it. As his thoughts grew more extravagant, his self-confidence grew more outrageous. The height it ultimately attained must be seen, in his writings, to be believed."

Not less interesting is this glimpse into the personal history and inner life of the philosopher:

"The other circumstance of a personal nature which it is impossible not to notice, because M. Comte is perpetually referring to it as the origin of the great superiority which he ascribes to his later as compared with his earlier speculations, is the "moral regeneration" which he underwent from "une angélique influence" and "une incomparable passion privée." He formed a passionate attachment to a lady whom he describes as uniting everything which is morally with much that is intellectually admirable, and his relation to whom, besides the direct influence of her character upon his own, gave him an insight into the true sources of human happiness, which changed his whole conception of life. This attachment, which always remained pure, gave him but one year of passionate enjoyment, the lady having been cut off by death at the end of that short period; but the adoration of her memory survived, and became, as we shall see, the type of his conception of the sympathetic culture proper for all human beings. The change thus effected in his personal character and sentiments manifested itself at once in his speculations; which, from having been only a philosophy, now aspired to become a religion; and from having been as purely, and almost rudely, scientific and intellectual, as was compatible with a character always enthusiastic in its admiration and in its ardor for improvement, became from this time what, for want of a better name, may be called sentimental; but sentimental in a way of its own, very curious to contemplate. In considering the system of religion, politics, and morals, which in his later writings

kind have enlisted under his banner, they must burn their ships. There is, though in a less offensive form, the same over-weening presumption in a suggestion he makes, that all species of animals and plants which are useless to man should be systematically rooted out. As if any one could presume to assert that the smallest weed may not, as knowledge advances, be found to have some property serviceable to men. When we consider that the united power of the whole human race cannot reproduce a species once eradicated—that what is once done, in the extirpation of races, can never be repaired, one can only be thankful that amidst all which the past rulers of mankind have to answer for, they have never come up to the measure of the great regenerator of Humanity; mankind have not yet been under the rule of one who assumes that he knows all there is to be known, and that when he puts himself at the head of humanity, the book of human knowledge may be closed."

His views on the constitution of society are something more than theoretically absurd; they do not stop short of a systematised impossibility:

"We have given a sufficient general idea of M. Comte's plan for the regeneration of human society, by putting an end to anarchy, and 'systematizing' human thought and conduct under the direction of feeling. But an adequate conception will not have been formed of the height of his self-confidence, until something more has been told. Be it known, then, that M. Comte by no means proposes this new constitution of society for realization in the remote future. A complete plan of measures of transition is ready prepared, and he determines the year, before the end of the present century, in which the new spiritual and temporal powers will be installed, and the régime of our maturity will begin. He did not, indeed, calculate on converting to Positivism, within that time, more than a thousandth part of all the heads of families in Western Europe and its offshoots beyond the Atlantic. But he fixes the time necessary for the complete political establishment of Positivism at thirty-three years, divided into three periods, of seven, five, and twenty-one years respectively. At the expiration of seven, the direction of public education in France would be placed in M. Comte's hands. In five years more, the Emperor Napoleon, or his successor, will resign his power to a provisional triumvirate, composed of three eminent proletaires of the positivist faith; for proletaires, though not fit for permanent rule, are the best agents of the transition, being most free from the prejudices which are the chief obstacle to it. These rulers will employ the remaining twenty-one years in preparing society for its final constitution; and after duly installing the Spiritual Power, and effecting the decomposition of France into the seventeen republics before mentioned, will give over the temporal government of each to the normal dictatorship of the three bankers. A man may be deemed happy, but scarcely modest, who had such boundless confidence in his own powers of foresight, and expected to complete a triumph of his own ideas on the reconstitution of society within the possible limits of his lifetime. If he could live (he said) to the age of Fontenelle, or of Hobbes, or even of Voltaire, he should see all this realized, or as good as realized. He died, however, at sixty, without leaving any disciple sufficiently advanced to be appointed his successor. There is now a College, and a Director, of Positivism; but Humanity no longer possesses a High Priest."

Equally autocratic and whimsical is his prescription or the attainment of a perfect style:

"These strange conceits are connected with a highly characteristic example of M. Comte's frenzy for regulation. He cannot bear that anything should be left unregulated; there ought to be no such thing as hesitation; nothing should remain arbitrary, for *l'arbitraire* is always favorable to egotism. Submission to artificial prescriptions is as indispensable as to natural laws, and he boasts that under the reign of sentiment, human life may be made equally, and even more, regular than the courses of the stars. But the great instrument of exact regulation for the details of life is numbers; fixed numbers, therefore, should be introduced into all our conduct. M. Comte's first application of this system was to the correction of his own literary style. Complaint had been made, not undeservedly, that in his first great work, especially in the latter part of it, the sentences and paragraphs were long, clumsy, and involved. To correct this fault, of which he was aware, he imposed on himself the following rules. No sentence was to exceed two lines of his manuscript, equivalent to five of print. No paragraph was to consist of more than seven sentences. He further applied to his prose writing the rule of French versification which forbids a *hiatus* (the concourse of two vowels), not allowing it to himself even at the break between two sentences or two paragraphs; nor did he permit himself ever to use the same word twice, either in the same sentence or in two consecutive sentences, though belonging to different paragraphs, with the exception of the monosyllabic auxiliaries. All this is well enough, especially the first two precepts, and a good way of breaking through a bad habit. But M. Comte persuaded himself that any arbitrary restriction, though in no way emanating from, and therefore necessarily disturbing, the natural order and proportion of the thoughts, is a benefit in itself, and tends to improve style. If it renders composition vastly more difficult, he rejoices at it, as tending to confine writing to superior minds. Accordingly, in the Synthèse Subjective, he institutes the following 'plan for all compositions of importance.' 'Every volume really capable of forming a distinct treatise should consist of 'seven chapters, besides the introduction and the conclusion; and each of these should be composed of three parts.' Each third part of a chapter should be divided into 'seven sections, each composed of seven groups of sentences, separated by the usual break of line. Normally formed, the section offers a central group of seven sentences, preceded and followed by three groups of five; the first section of each part reduces to three sentences three of its groups, symmetrically placed; the last section gives seven sentences to each of its extreme groups. These rules of composition make prose approach to the regularity of poetry, when combined with my previous reduction of the maximum length of a sentence to two manuscript or five printed lines, that is, 250 letters.' 'Normally constructed, great poems consist of thirteen cantos, decomposed into parts, sections, and groups like my chapters, saving the complete equality of the groups and of the sections.' 'This difference of structure between volumes of poetry and of philosophy is more apparent than real, for the introduction and the conclusion of a poem should comprehend six of its thirteen cantos,' leaving, therefore, the cabalistic number seven for the body of the poem. And all this regulation not being sufficiently meaningless, fantastic, and oppressive, he invents an elaborate system for compelling each of his sections and groups to begin with a letter of the alphabet, determined beforehand, the letters being selected so as to compose words having 'a synthetic or sympathetic signification,' and as close a relation as possible to the section or part to which they are appropriated.

In the pathos of Mr. Mile's comment, his readers, we are sure, will find their own feelings expressed:

"Others may laugh, but we could far rather weep at this melancholy decadence of a great intellect. M. Comte used to reproach his early English admirers with maintaining the 'conspiracy of silence' concerning his later performances. The reader can now judge whether such reticence is not more than sufficiently explained by tenderness for his fame, and a conscientious fear of bringing undeserved discredit on the noble speculations of his earlier career."

"The Anti-Slavery Revolution in America" may be divided into two parts, of which the former, having to deal with matters that have passed into history, is a much clearer and more accurate statement than the latter, which treats of the events of the war in their relation to slavery. The writer speaks in one sentence of the defeat of Bull Run having resulted from the "fearful mismeasurement of the Southern movement and resources" shown in President Lincoln's first call for 75,000 men. A little further on it is ascribed to "the failure of Gen. Patterson to engage the Confederate Gen. Johnston." Neither is the true cause, though the charge against Patterson is true. Bull Run was lost by the imbecility—to use no harsher word—of Gen. Scott in the council, and of Gen. McDowell in the field. The appointment of McClellan to command the Army of the Potomac is charged to the clamor of the Democrats. It was made by Secretary Cameron on the faith of the Western Virginia successes, then supposed to have been McClellan's work, now known to have been due to the genius and energy of Rosecrans. The delay of McClellan in Washington is forgotten, in order to dwell on the procrastinating timidity before Richmond, which deserves all censure; but was less openly treacherous than the other. Again, McClellan was not "retained some months after his failure in a restricted command." Pope was in command for a few days of nearly all McClellan's troops when they were brought up from the Peninsula, but after Pope's disgraceful defeat—disgraceful both to him and to McClellan, who conspired to bring it about—McClellan resumed command of the armies, held it through the Maryland campaign, and was removed for reiterated refusals to cross the Potomac and attack Lee. The most singular blunder in the article is that which ascribes the renomination of Lincoln to the capture of Vicksburg, which took place the year before. These and other errors, however, do not affect the *general* truthfulness and excellent spirit of the article.

"Imperial History" is a criticism on Napoleon's Life of Cæsar, by a hand that uses the scalpel with as much freedom as if a lesser criminal were to be dissected after death. A cordial eulogy upon Theodore Winthrop, with an analysis of his more important books, is by an American author. "Contemporary Literature," as usual, closes the number, and, as usual, these briefer criticisms are direct, pointed, and fair in tone. As a summary of notices upon the recent books, they are always valuable.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER. September, 1865. Walker, Fuller, & Co. Boston.

"Theism and Christianity" which opens the present number, is less a criticism of Dr. Hedge's "Reason in Religion" which offered occasion for the article, than a thoughtful statement of the writer's own views on the problems of Dr. Hedge's book. Dr. Lyman Beecher's autobiography, and the heterogeneous contents of the two volumes which Charles Beecher has published as a Life, are the text of a very catholic and genial survey of the Calvinist Divine. "Radicalism and Conservatism" is by Orville Dewey, and is not a review article, but an address to the graduating class of the Cambridge Divinity School. It is such a plea for compromise in politics as we hope the *Examiner* does not mean to adopt or endorse hereafter. Other articles are "South Carolina one of the United States," "Horace Mann and Antioch College," "Spencer's Social Statics," "State Crimes and Their Penalty." The Review of Current Literature is less full than usual. It is an attractive feature when copious and well done.

Our Boston Correspondence.

BOSTON, September 25, 1865.

I WAS very glad to see, in its appropriate place in the last STANDARD, the base letter of "A Yankee," the London *Spectator's* New York correspondent. In another letter (*Spectator*, Sept. 2d) this calumniator returns to the charge, saying:

"The negro Davenport, who married the white woman, has thought it advisable to leave Greenwich. In this quiet, sober Connecticut village—I know the place well—where he was justified in killing an unarmed man who had not even assaulted him (whatever his purpose might have been), and where the jury before whom he was brought assured him that he should be completely protected in every legal right, he yet found that it would not do for him to live with a white wife, even although she was an Irish emigrant. It may be all very base and bad, but politicians must deal with facts."

It *is* all very base and bad, including the letter of this mendacious Yankee. The very truths that he tells are designed and suited to suggest false ideas. True, Connecticut is of the quiet and sober sort. Its people understand that rioting and drunkenness don't *pay*. The vices for which tradition gives them credit are of the mean and sneaking kind. Their clock-makers and wooden-nutmeg manufacturers led a quiet and industrious life, and took good care to keep their wits about them to be used in the way of business. One important feature of their way of business was to be pliant to the vices of their Southern customers. The State generally took a South-side view of the "peculiar institution." The little town of Canterbury, in the same State, was quiet and sober. Probably nothing would have stirred up its people to riot short of the unendurable outrage of a white schoolmistress admitting colored children among her pupils. That was an event demanding decisive action. The quiet and sober citizens set themselves in array against Prudence Crandall, the skilful and experienced teacher. They subjected her to every description of petty social ostracism. When she persevered, the quiet and sober citizens pelted her and her assistants with rotten eggs; they broke her windows; they filled her well with filth and offal; and they used similar mild measures against the colored children, to prevent their attendance on the school. These steps proving ineffectual, the State Legislature made a law forbidding the teaching of colored children. The noble woman still persisted in her benevolent and Christian enterprise, and legal proceedings were immediately instituted against her by Judge Judson, of Canterbury, a chief instigator of the previous outrages. She was imprisoned under this charge, and placed in the cell whence a convicted murderer had lately gone out to be hanged. And when, after her release, the undaunted woman resumed her labors, the various forms of persecution were so systematically kept up by the sober and quiet citizens that it became necessary to abandon the enterprise. Since that time the laws of Connecticut have yielded somewhat to the advance of civilization and Christianity; but her sober and quiet people retain some of their old prejudices, and there is no lack of Yankees to attempt the justification of these prejudices by argument.

It is a comfort to find, in the number of the *Spectator* containing this second letter, two communications from Americans in England, one signed "Another Yankee" and the other "A New England Yankee"—repudiating the ideas and correcting the misrepresentations of the New York correspondent. The current of public opinion seems to have so far changed there that now, at length, the truth respecting American affairs has a chance to be heard, whether or not it is heeded.

If the things most important to our welfare were only heeded at home, misconceptions and enmities abroad would be of small consequence. But it is to be feared that the rumor lately prevailing is true, that Alexander H. Stephens is not only to be released from his confinement here in Fort Warren, but that he is to go, commissioned by President Johnson, to aid in the reconstruction of Georgia, and to influence the people of his class to unite in the movement now in progress there. Certain of our papers favor this plan, and urge the immediate release of the rebel Vice-President, naming among other reasons for this step the fact that he is much esteemed at the South, and the supposition that kindness to him will produce gratitude and confidence there.

To me this seems like a wanton sacrifice of the most substantial advantage the war has gained for us. We have just escaped from the tyranny of this very Southern aristocracy which it is now proposed to conciliate. Our laws, our rights, our liberties were trampled in the dust by this very class of men, and the danger is that any arrangement whatever which we may make will leave them too much influence; too much opportunity to interweave, in the process of reconstruction, their poisonous doctrines of the degrading character of manual labor—of the necessity of having a servile class in the community to perform it—of the natural fitness of the negroes (and equally of their own children by negro women) to occupy this subordinate place—and of their own natural fitness to be the governing class, controlling alike negroes and Yankees at their pleasure. What can possibly be gained to the country's strength, or credit, or enlightenment, or liberty, or welfare in any manner or degree, by admitting people of this class to settle the terms of reconstruction, or to have any least voice in settling them? Their Government, in the years preceding 1860, brought us to the brink of ruin. It is now essential to the public welfare not only that they should cease to govern, but that they should *be governed*; and be governed by those very rules of justice and freedom which they always hated, and which they raised the rebellion to overthrow. The fortune of war has put it in our power to keep these miscreants out of the Government, and to keep them under suitable restraint. If we fail to do both these things, we shall violate the chief duties of our present position.

To-day we have had the reception and final review of the Fifty-Fifth regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry. This was the second colored regiment raised by Massachusetts, and like its predecessor, the Fifty-Fourth, it was officered by men who sympathized with the colored people, and wished to be their associates in a war that was expected to accomplish so much for their rights. The regiment comes back about 800 strong, and in good health and fine condition. Arriving in the harbor a short time since, they were landed for payment and muster out on Gallop's Island. This morning at 9 o'clock they were received by an escort of honor, civil and military, with fine bands of music; and they marched through the principal streets of the city, gratifying their numerous friends by their soldierly bearing and their fine appearance generally. The streets through which they passed were crowded with interested and admiring spectators, and the whole city seemed to share the joy of their successful return from dangers far greater than those which beset ordinary soldiers.

As they passed the State-House, their marching salute was received (in the absence of Gov. Andrew from the city) by Adj.-Gen. Schouler, and the Governor's staff. Other distinguished citizens stood with this body of officials, among whom was Senator Charles Sumner; and for him loud and hearty cheers were repeatedly given by the colored citizens who formed part of the escort. If all men of power and influence would show themselves on the right side with such vigor and emphasis as have marked his political movements, the whole nation would speedily find itself on the way to assured and permanent prosperity.

After completing the line of march marked out for them, the Fifty-Fifth regiment had a review and dress-parade on the Common, where their soldier-like appearance and the very remarkable precision of their evolutions called forth new applause from the spectators. After this the regiment partook of a bountiful collation that had been prepared for them, and found in social converse with their relatives and friends the beginning of that high satisfaction that comes from finding one's self again at home.

To us who had staid at home through all the stirring events of the past four years, it was particularly pleasing to see those colored soldiers who have received commissions for signal bravery or other special merits, in the campaign just finished. Not only does the appearance of these men speak volumes in their favor, but their record during the war is a tacit reproach to the tardiness and timidity of that Government which was so slow in acknowledging their merits, and recompensing their noble self-devotion. It will be one of the blackest features in the record of this nation if, after the testimony which this war has given of high and noble qualities, and capabilities equal to our own, existing in the negro, we withhold from him the right of cooperating with us in self-government. But if, withholding this right, we give to the rebel whites of the South the forfeited privilege of voting, and thus the power still to oppress those who have helped us to gain the victory over them, we shall deserve the worst retribution that a just God may have in store for us.

NORTH.

OUR LOUISIANA CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 15th, 1865.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—Notwithstanding President Johnson has lately given a *backward* turn to the wheels of Government at Washington, and shown by his late speech to the Southern delegation, a determination—in standing by the *well-harped-on* "*constitution*"—to prevent, if possible, the reconstruction of the Southern States upon the basis of universal suffrage—notwithstanding this exhibition of retrogradation, yet are we here vigorously pushing ahead the car of progress—taking time by the forelock—and claiming by *force* the rights that are denied us by fair means.

A NEW MOVE UPON THE POLITICAL CHESS-BOARD.

During the past month a registry of all the colored men competent by age and otherwise to become citizens, has been going on, and to-day an election is being held throughout the State by the same, for delegates to a convention which is to assemble next Monday, to select candidates for election to the next United States Congress, as the colored people here claim that they are the only loyal element of the State, and that they are entitled to representation in Congress; and as they cannot gain the right of suffrage in the regular elections here, they take this method of bringing their claims before the people and the United States Government. That they are about the only loyal element, with the exception of a few brave white men who have nobly dared to champion universal rights, there is no doubt; that they will elect members to the next United States Congress there is no doubt; and that these members will stand the best chance of admission, there is no doubt, and they will most certainly make their claim, and with so much justice and truth in their favor that it will be difficult for Congress to ignore their demand.

GOVERNOR WELLS' INTRIGUES.

"And yet another Douglass is in the field." It was rumored here last week, and so published in the papers, that this infamous Governor Wells had been appointed Provisional Governor of Louisiana by President Johnson. Wells was absent in the country at the time making capital for the next gubernatorial election, but was immediately summoned here by his satellites, and started *instanter* for Washington. Upon the strength of this, the Copperhead Government organ here came out with flaming articles, proclaiming that a new government was to be instituted, the constitution of 1864 to be abrogated, a new convention to be called, a new constitution to be made, and U. S. Senators elected. This arouses the Banks Free State party and their senators elect, and causes the immediate dispatch of ex-Gen. Banks, to Washington, to prevent, if possible, the hatching of the Wells egg; so that by the time Wells reaches headquarters, Banks will be close in his rear, and more violent, I anticipate, in his attack than when Stonewall Jackson or Dick Taylor confronted him in 1862 and 1863. Ostensibly, Gen. Banks has left Louisiana, but in reality he has not given up his citizenship here, or his aspirations for the United States Senatorship from this State. He knows that if Wells is appointed Provisional Governor his chance of manipulating the next Legislature—a portion of which are his old *creatures* and *creation*—will be gone, and he will be *hors du combat* on every side. So there bids fair to be a three-cornered fight; the Radicals upon one wing, the Banks Free State elect upon the other, and the aspirants spawned by the Wells Provisional Government in the rear; and that it will be an interesting one, and result in the absorption of the Banks clique by the Radical party, and the overthrow of the Conservatives, no one who knows the temper of our next Congress can for a moment doubt. This is simply the incubation of the Free State 1864 constitution. It has to pass through this purification, heating and hatching process ere it is fit to come out a full-fledged bantling and flap its new-born wings to the tune of Liberty and Universal Suffrage.

THE RADICALS AND THEIR ORGANIZATION.

The Radicals are becoming thoroughly organized, the Executive Committee located here, with the Hon. Thos. Durant as Chairman, being the head of the organization, and branches of the same being created in every parish of the State. Their strength will exceed all parties combined, and already many of those who have heretofore claimed to be Conservative Republicans are making application for admission to the ranks of the Radicals. The Free State party have no other haven to fly to, and they are gathering up their mantles preparatory to a grand exodus from the rickety craft launched for their comfort by Messrs. Banks, Hahn, & Co., in 1864. King Cutler, one of the United States Senators elect, remarked to the writer a few days since, "that he went for making a fight against Wells in the coming fall elections, and if beaten, which he thought likely, then for an abrogation of the present State Government, a military protectorate, universal suffrage, and the consequent overthrow of anything looking like conservatism." This is a huge step for a Free State party man, but evidences which way the wind is blowing in that quarter. It may be necessary that we should have a Governor Wells and his acts in order that such gentlemen and their satellites may be educated to a proper realization of what true loyalty is.

Col. Fields, who, it will be remembered, achieved notoriety in Washington last winter in connection with the assault on Congressman Kelly, is also out at the head of a Conservative Union party; but he is only known for his *copperish* proclivities, and only splits the ranks of the opponents of universal suffrage. So much the better; the more of such, the better, gentlemen. If we can only keep them fighting among themselves, and Congress will stand by us, we are all right, and cannot fail of speedy success. But the dreadful *thought* comes—what if Congress fails to stand firm and admits these bogus States with their pro-slavery exponents? Then let me surely predict that an appeal to arms will be again made by the friends of universal liberty. No people in the world are more susceptible to principles of right and justice than the colored race, and none more willing to support the Government with their lives and labor; but it is time that they should as a just compensation have their rights; and it is already whispered among them, and the echo of their determination reverberates throughout the Southern country, that if Government, for which they have done so much, denies their just privileges and seeks again to enthrall them, then will they not hesitate to buckle on the armor and take the bayonet for an arbiter of their destiny. I have mingled a great deal with these people, and I know this to be the determination and the key-note of all their action. Surely our glorious Congress cannot and will not force these already burdened people to this dire alternative. The God of justice and freedom will get them out of their political as well as personal bondage, and Congress will be the exponent of the good work.

VIATOR.

A REVEREND SHEPHERDESS.—More than a year since, says the Boston *Universalist*, a female preacher, Rev. Olympia Brown, was installed pastor of the Universalist Society at Weymouth Landing. The novelty was calculated to create a temporary interest wholly independent of the merits of the preacher. Everybody must go at least once to see so strange a thing as a woman in the pulpit. But the novelty has worn away; and whatever prosperity now appears in the Weymouth society, ought in common fairness, to be set down as genuine, and therefore as having all the elements of durability. It therefore gives us sincere pleasure to record a very successful ministry since the day of the installation. If all the ministers of the stronger sex had half the zeal and industry of Rev. Olympia Brown, the result would be apparent in prospering parishes. During the long probation of more than a year, she has honestly earned a right to this honorable mention of her labors.

FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—I am permitted to make the following extract from a private letter from Charleston. It is written by a gentleman familiar with the state of things now existing there. After referring to the course of Gov. Perry, which, however "satisfactory" to such Copperheads as Gillmore and Meade, is admitted even by Conservatives like Gen. Hatch to have checked the growth of loyalty in South Carolina, the writer proceeds:

Will the people of the North stand by and see the loyalists of this State delivered up, bound hand and foot, and gagged, to such men as this Gov. Perry? * * * Yet it is useless to condemn or denounce him, merely, *for he is one of our very fairest samples of loyalty among the native white population.* It is the President's policy that we should assail. A few weeks ago a petition, signed by nearly two thousand colored loyalists, was forwarded to the President, asking for the appointment of John C. Fremont as Military Governor of South Carolina. He is a native of the State; why not select him? Surely, if true loyalty is to be honored, these petitioners should be heard and their request should be granted.

WHITE AND COLORED LOYALISTS.

For the colored people are fanatically loyal. They worship the flag; they cannot do the North too much honor; they eagerly clutch at every chance to show their gratitude to us. When our forces entered the city their exultation was unbounded. *The whites gave us no welcome whatever.* When Mr. Lincoln was murdered every colored church was hung in mourning, the vast majority of the colored people wore crape, and they wept as for a father slain in every humble home circle in the city. But many of the whites openly rejoiced at the assassination; and when a meeting was called by the Generals in command to do honor to the memory of the martyred President *there were not twenty white natives present at it!* When the old flag was hoisted at Fort Sumter the Planter was covered by as many colored persons as could cling to it—fifteen hundred at the lowest computation, while you could count on your fingers all the prominent Charlestonians who came over to see it. Gov. Aiken, much lauded by some people as a loyalist, was not there, although he was expected and invited.

When recruiting offices were established in the city, the blacks flocked to them by hundreds; and when the recruiting was suddenly stopped many stalwart men wept because they had come in too late. But no white recruits ever offered! A patriotic Irishman tried to raise a battalion, but failed to enlist a single man.

The Union League was organized. As rapidly as members could be sworn in, they were admitted. It numbered between eight hundred and one thousand persons within less than a month from the date of the establishment, and it is rapidly spreading over all the State. No white natives will join it. Its test is too severe for them.

At one time, shortly before the close of the war, it was feared that the rebel cavalry would make a dash into the city. The chivalry were exultant. The colored people entreated the powers that be—by proxy—to organize a Home Guard Brigade. Reluctantly the permission was granted to form a battalion, and it was filled up in less than a week. Against every discouragement they have held fast to the organization, and you may have noticed that it paraded on the Fourth of July. It is likewise a noteworthy fact that thus our national holiday was honored in Charleston by the colored people alone. None of the vaunted white loyalists took any steps to do honor to the day *we* celebrated—not even one of them, although hundreds of them hold office here.

I sent you, at the time, an account of the manner in which the entire colored population of Charleston did honor to the soldiers who perished from hunger and exposure on the Race Course. No white native volunteered to take any part therein, or expressed any sympathy for our martyrs. But nearly all of them are prompt to defend their murderers, and to deny that they were otherwise than tenderly treated. One colored woman was whipped to death because she gave one of our starving soldiers food. Many were severely punished by men who have taken the oath and are regarded as loyal if not patriotic citizens.

Their loyalty has had to stand many severe tests here. Nothing has been voluntarily done for them by our officers. Everything has been granted to the importunities of a few Abolitionists. The 127th N. Y. V. I. insulted the colored people everywhere, stoned them, knocked them down, and cut them; and when it was mustered out, a legion of devils known as Duryea's Zouaves took its place and acted so cruelly that Gen. Gillmore was compelled to drive them out of the city. For they did not stop at assault and battery; they shot and murdered the unoffending loyalists. Nearly all our officers are hand-in-glove with the rebel citizens. Notorious rebels hold offices; but not one colored loyalist. And yet they believe that however base our representatives may be, however unworthy of the uniform they wear, our flag is now full of North Stars, and we have nailed it to the Cross, never more to tear it down from its sacred and fitting eminence.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY.—PENNSYLVANIA POLITICS.

PHILADELPHIA, September 19, 1865.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—I may write that to you which it would be quite useless for me to send to many journals—the plain truth. For it has been customary with the STANDARD to disregard the general rule of newspapers in this respect, and publish just such unusual matter as the aforesaid.

It seems to me that the great duty always is JUSTICE. And that is what we should strive for now. For years and years we refused it, and then we reaped our punishment. The question concerning us now simply is, Can we do justice in the future?

It is the conviction among all liberal people that we are adopting a queer mode of being just, in our Reconstruction policy. The war was carried on, on our part, under the impression that the rebels were grossly, criminally wrong; that they were perpetrating a fearful offence against humanity, right, and law. For four years we suffered, labored, and poured out blood, in an attempt to subdue these criminals; and now that we have succeeded we find that they are not criminals at all; they are our equals if not our superiors. No stigma attaches to their rebellion; no punishments follow their crimes; no deprivations are to be placed upon them for treason. Not at all. Our President—the Chief Magistrate who was elected by us, when these rebels were using their utmost exertions not only to defeat him, but to prevent his having a country to govern when he should be elected—now hugs them to his bosom with a fervor that decidedly overdoes any embraces he ever gave to us. So that, when crime is fully accomplished, it is no crime at all; and when the perpetrators have completed their work they are petted and forgiven, instead of being rebuked and punished.

Is this JUSTICE?

Besides that, we had a few friends in the South during the war. They assisted us by every means in their power, and if it had been by prayers alone, they would have been entitled to our eternal gratitude; but they rendered us most valuable assistance. Now we find that our friends who happen to be neither very well educated, nor very handsome, nor very wealthy, are being treated with infinitely less consideration than those who have been our deadly enemies, but may be more educated, wealthy, and handsome.

Is *this* the form of JUSTICE?

Thinking men—and they, let us rejoice at the fact, are more numerous now than ever before—see all these things and feel discouraged, disgusted, and out of humor at the course of things. It is so everywhere. You need not suppose that mental light is confined to any particular locality. Here in Philadelphia we appreciate our wretched position and long for better things. We have no newspapers that speak for us, it is true, but you know that authority and patronage are very powerful.

Philadelphia's politics are not in a hopeful situation, unless good shall come out of temporary abasement. The management of things here, in the Union and Democrat parties, has fallen into the hands of professional politicians, who have grown fat, saucy, and self-confident with their past successes. In making their city nominations this fall, their inclinations and interests were alone consulted. They did not do JUSTICE, for they renominated all the old incumbents who have drawn their full share of sustenance from the public fountain, and refused to recognize the services of a single returned soldier.

Politics in Philadelphia are therefore in a sad muddle, and the Union city ticket has the greatest chance of being defeated. It will be a pity for one or two men upon it, and possibly for the cause; but so far as most of the nominees are concerned, very many Union people will not be sorry, but will simply say that such is the result of *in*-justice.

Pennsylvania and Philadelphia are not really as they look to be on the surface. Thaddeus Stevens' late address at Lancaster has met with sympathetic response from the popular heart. We long for something that savors of doing JUSTICE, and we rejoice to hear almost any doctrine which seems bluntly and fearlessly to incline in that direction.

Yours, BRUIN.

THE SOUTH AND THE NEGROES.

MISSISSIPPI.

THE EFFECT OF THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY.

UNDER date of the 14th inst., Col. Thomas, Assistant-Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau for the State of Mississippi, reports that 81 plantations, embracing 18,500 acres, are leased by freedmen in the States of Louisiana and Mississippi, while 120 plantations, consisting of 52,500 acres, are leased by loyal whites. About one-half the lands leased to white lessees have been abandoned, owing to the overflow of the Mississippi.

In his report Col. Thomas says: "A tremendous pressure is being brought to bear by returning citizens of all classes, to get possession of their property. They are constantly writing letters to the President and the heads of the different bureaus at Washington, filled with all kinds of misrepresentations in order to effect their purpose." As an illustration of the opposition of the planters to the distribution of abandoned lands among freedmen, Col. Thomas says:

"I have made no attempt to distribute lands in small lots to the negroes, as I know it will meet with strong opposition from all parties. It will require a hero to execute it, and a military force to protect the freedmen during the term of their lease. He also states that he believes he will yet find it necessary to withdraw many of his officers for want of military protection, so averse are the planters to conforming to the free-labor system. The total number of freedmen in the State of Louisiana receiving rations from the Government is at present 2,000."

In reference to the organization of the militia of Mississippi, Col. Thomas remarks: "The organization of the militia in this State has created a greater panic among the freedmen than any action of the Federal or late Confederate authorities. It will do more to disturb the relation of the freedmen to the whites of the State than anything which has yet been done. If the militia is organized, as foreshadowed by the Governor's proclamation and endorsed by the President of the United States in his dispatch to the Governor, I have no idea that the freedmen will remain quiet laborers in the cotton fields.

"They are excited and partially armed. They have some idea of what war is. They certainly know all about slavery, and have no idea of returning to any such condition. That collisions will occur, that a disturbed state of society will be the result, there is no question. The hope of organizing the labor of the State in such a way that the freedmen will return to the fields and assist in recruiting the agricultural wealth of the State as free laborers, seems to vanish with the promulgation of this militia order.

"The members of the late State Convention have visited me, and are anxious to have me prepare for them some suggestion for adoption at the meeting of the Legislature, by which they can take complete charge of the freedmen's affairs, and do away with the necessity for United States officers. I hear of but little trouble between freedmen and their employers. Nearly all the colored people of the State working on plantations have been contracted with, and employers are anxious to contract for the year 1866, for fear labor will be hard to get at the beginning of the season."

Col. Thomas was originally the commanding officer of the 8th Vermont Regiment, and a Brockenridge Democrat of the most radical stripe. Three months' residence among the people of New Orleans convinced him of the error of his ways, and made him an earnest champion of the freedmen of the South.

ALABAMA.

MONTGOMERY, Ala., September 25.—An ordinance declaring the act of secession null and void was unanimously adopted by the Alabama State Convention to-day, after having been debated the entire day.

SECOND DISPATCH.

WASHINGTON, September 26.—A special dispatch to the *Chronicle*, dated Montgomery, Ala., September 25th, says:

"No vote has yet been taken concerning the subject of the Alabama State debt. It has been referred to a committee, who will report on it in a day or two.

"The Convention adopted the ordinance for the abolition of slavery with only three dissenting votes."

A THREATENED EXTERMINATION.

The following letter from a prominent citizen of New Orleans, who has resided in Louisiana fifteen years, to a friend in Illinois, exhibits the first workings of the proposed reorganization of the rebel army in Mississippi:

NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 8, 1865.

DEAR SIR: The action of the President in sustaining Sharkey against Gen. Slocum is most untoward. No Union men, that is to say, no man approving the war for the salvation of the country, is safe in that State. I had occasion a few days ago to send an officer to Port Gibson, where at the time there were no troops. While he was there, a man who through all the rebellion had refused to aid it in any way, was set upon by a crowd of returned rebel soldiers, and it was with difficulty he escaped by rushing through a house, and into the woods. He was a blacksmith. My officer got away as soon as he could, leaving his business untouched. The negroes are shot down wantonly every day, in all parts of Mississippi, and no one is punished, or even arrested for it.

Perhaps things will come out all right, but I confess that I do not see the way. The Union men are not only quite discouraged, but greatly alarmed. Any one who knows anything of Southern society, and the spirit of secession, must understand that the "Snake is scotched, not killed."

We are not at the end of our trouble by a long way, that is clear.

I anticipate something like this: the horrible treatment of the freedmen by the infuriated rebels will ere long produce its natural fruit—retaliation, and then a war of extermination upon them. The United States forces will be required to aid the whites, or to stand still and see the butchery going on. How would the world regard that picture?

I will write you again soon. This is written in great haste, and only to keep you advised of how things appear to Union men here.

Very respectfully, ——

THE HISTORY OF THE SHARKEY PROCLAMATION.

A correspondent of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, writing from Mississippi, states that Gov. Sharkey, at the time of his appointment, required as a condition of accepting the office, that he should be permitted to retain in office certain rebels whose retention would be objected to by the Radicals, and that he should be permitted to recognize the Mississippi rebel militia as a substitute for National troops. To both of these terms the President acceded. Nevertheless, when Gov. Sharkey issued his proclamation calling for troops, the President substantially revoked it by a dispatch directing him to defer such action till civil order in the State had been more completely restored. Gov. Sharkey bowed to the decision. Meanwhile Gen. Slocum's order followed, and Gov. Sharkey fell into another military difficulty with Gen. Osterhaus relative to the claim of the latter officer to try before a military court a case of a secessionist murdering a freedman. The War Department having issued instructions to commanding officers to try all cases in which freedmen were involved, and in which they had reason to believe the civil tribunals would evade doing justice, Gen. Osterhaus claimed that the refusal of the civil tribunal in charge of this case, in two previous instances to punish the offender, brought the case within the order of the War Department. Gov. Sharkey, without, it appears, controverting this position, claimed that Gen. Osterhaus should have made a requisition upon him, as Governor, for the prisoner. We are not told whether, if made, he would have granted it; but offended in these successive instances by the President, Gen. Slocum and Gen. Osterhaus, he complained to the President, and was on the point of sending in his resignation unless he should receive his (the President's) support." Thereupon the President, without consultation with a single cabinet officer, sent the dispatch sustaining Sharkey and overruling Slocum. If this be the true statement of the facts, it only goes to show that the President regarded the reasoning of the Mississippi rebels as impolitic, but was bullied into conceding it by Gov. Sharkey's threats to resign.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.—Henry Ward Beecher gave a discourse at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, to an immense congregation on Sunday evening, from the report of which is the following on the right of suffrage:

"I hold that this nation can take care of these freedmen temporarily. It must only be temporarily, because it is in the law of natu e that men shall take care of themselves. But how can we do this if we don't recognize them as men. I merely demand for the black man that he shall have the rights of a decent white man. I hold that every man under a law has a right to have a voice in the framing of that law. I advocate the enfranchisement of the freedman not because he is prepared for it, but because he must learn by practising his right. I would give the right of suffrage to every foreigner—to every Irishman; though I think that the negro would invariably cast his vote more in the spirit of our institutions than the Irish do." Mr. Beecher strongly advocated the right of women to vote, holding that their not being allowed to vote was an evidence of the old doctrine of "superiority"—of men being superior to women. He held that the right of suffrage must eventually be universal in this country, and recognized in this a grand principle which is already pervading all nations. "Any man who does not believe in this grand political truth of America, is no statesman. These men who combat this great idea of liberty invariably get beaten in the end, and usually explain it by saying that the 'Radicals' overcame them. Yes, it is the 'Radicals'—it is the root of good, the root of right, the root of divine power which must overcome them. They call the Radicals disturbers of the peace. God dedicates, and denies his attributes when he permits peace before justice is done to our freedmen. It will be the climax and completion of Christ's example when this object is accomplished."

HARPER'S FERRY—ITS STORY.

From the Philadelphia Press.

HARPER'S FERRY, the marvel of tourists, has enough beauty lavished upon it by nature to make it celebrated forever, even if varied interests of many other kinds were not congregated around its majestic bluffs. In our old peaceful days it enjoyed a semi-romantic fame as serving as a kind of Gretna Green, to which, by long-established custom, all runaway lovers from the neighboring States fled for that matrimonial balm or band that they expected to end all their sorrows.

That sturdy pioneer, old John Brown, here antedated by but a few years the impending conflict which was to be the deathblow of the national sin that he so hated; and history has since (as it always does) rewritten the wildest dreams of the true-hearted visionary into fact, and shown again that every grand advance in the march of mankind must be preceded by a line of devoted skirmishers, the forlorn hope of the present, who will be the recognized martyrs of the future!

By a strange coincidence, one of the earliest events of the war was another seizure of this grand mountain gateway by another "traitor;" but the cause was changed, and it was held by mad Southern fanatics as a key to the capital of their endangered country.

These first days of terror passed, and again the grand old ferry was held by a loyal leader—a man who had learned well his lesson of fealty on the bloody border lands of Kansas. To round the story into poetic fulness, beside him stood one to whom the very ground beneath his feet was sacred to liberty, for there he had fought a harder battle when he sought a convict's body, wrapped in the opprobrium of the gallows, and bore it away confident in the hope that when it was mouldering in the ground the soul that had led that mad, wild scheme would still be marching on, to achieve by wiser means the initiated work.

The war raged on and victory followed the banner of the Union into far distant States, yet the ferry lay still in the midst of the bloody debatable ground, where the two forces strove for masterdom with all the intensity of border warfare

Miscellaneous Department.

IPHIGENEIA.

IPHIGENEIA, when she heard her doom
At Aulis, and when all beside the king
Had gone away, took his right hand, and said,
"O father! I am young and very happy.
I do not think the pious Calchas heard
Distinctly what the Goddess spake. Old age
Obscures the senses. If my nurse, who knew
My voice so well, sometimes misunderstood,
While I was resting on her knee both arms
And hitting it to make her mind my words,
And looking in her face, and she in mine,
Might not he also hear one word amiss,
Spoken from so far off, even from Olympus?"
The father placed his cheek upon her head,
And tears dropt down it, but the king of men
Replied not. Then the maiden spake once more.
"O father! sayst thou nothing? Hear'st thou not
Me, whom thou ever hast, until this hour,
Listen'd to fondly, and awaken'd me
To hear my voice amid the voice of birds,
When it was inarticulate as theirs,
And the down deadened it within the nest?"
He moved her gently from him, silent still.
And this, and this alone, brought tears from her,
Altho' she saw fate nearer: then with sighs,
"I thought to have laid down my hair before
Benignant Artemis, and not have dimm'd
Her polish'd altar with my virgin blood;
I thought to have selected the white flowers
To please the Nymphs, and to have ask'd of each
By name, and with no sorrowful regret,
Whether, since both my parents will'd the change,
I might at Hymen's feet bend my clipt brow;
And (after these who mind us girls the most)
Adore our own Athena, that she would
Regard me mildly with her azure eyes.
But, father! to see you no more, and see
Your love, O father! go ere I am gone!"
Gently he moved her off, and drew her back,
Bending his lofty head far over hers,
And the dark depths of nature heaved and burst.
He turn'd away; not far, but silent still.
She now first shudder'd; for in him, so nigh,
So long a silence seem'd the approach of death,
And like it. Once again she rais'd her voice.
"O father! if the ships are now detain'd,
And all your vows move not the Gods above,
When the knife strikes me there will be one prayer
The less to them: and purer can there be
Any, or more fervent than the daughter's prayer
For her dear father's safety and success?"
A groan that shook him shook not his resolve.
An aged man now enter'd, and without
One word, stept slowly on, and took the wrist
Of the pale maiden. She look'd up, and saw
The fillet of the priest and calm cold eyes.
Then turn'd she where her parent stood, and cried
"O father! grieve no more: the ships can sail."

WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR.

HOW SHALL WE FURNISH OUR HOUSES?

From the New Path.

CHINA, GLASS, AND SILVER WARE.

No part of the furnishing of our houses is so generally satisfactory to ourselves as the furniture of the dinner-table. We do not take much interest in the form of tables and chairs, or in the patterns and colors of carpets and curtains; and if we are ever induced to observe a little more carefully than we have done, we find them incapable of exciting interest, and often very ugly. But a well-furnished and "elegant" dinner-table pleases everybody. The lady who sits at its head looks upon it with much satisfaction; and this not only because it gratifies her pride of possession, or her desire to excel in splendor of display, but also because it is really pleasant to her sight. The visitor has probably seen during the day no inanimate thing which seemed so fair; and this not only because he loves a good dinner, and sees in this the promise of it, but also because it is more nearly beautiful than his office, his friend's parlor, any household furniture he knows, or anything he sees in the streets.

The reasons for this are not far to seek. In the first place, neatness is a charm to many to whom the sense of beauty seems almost entirely denied; and the presiding genius of table-decoration is neatness. Not cleanliness, only, but brilliant, snowy, dazzling spotlessness. All the accessories of the table must be flawless and perfect, and of such nature, and such make, that they are not easily soiled. Steel knives must be silver plated; because steel is not uncontaminate when acids form part of the meal. When their edges are a little worn they must be replated; not because they are less clean, but because they look so, or look as if they might easily become so. The glossy, white china must be put to humbler use when a chipped edge or a crack appears; for brown flecks upon its purity, no matter from what cause arising, cannot be endured. The glass must be as clear and as glittering as diamond, for nothing suggests such absolute purity as unclouded transparency. Plain white table-cloths, or rather white with a white figure, are the only wear; the blue and red-edged ones will pass for breakfast and luncheon, but would hardly be endured even then, if their blue or red stripes lay upon the top of the table. The neatness of a well-prepared table is a matter of art and skill, not so much of that natural feeling which makes people neat in their dress, as of art and skill. There are no more perfect tables than those of a great restaurant; but the waiter who makes the table he attends at the Cafe Foy or Delmonico's such a union of comfort and elegance, may not be naturally neat, but only a skilful waiter. And this look of perfect cleanliness in the aspect of our dinner-tables is almost beautiful, more nearly beautiful than anything in the look of our household furniture.

Another reason is as follows: the utensils that make up the greater part of our table furniture are small, and, as they must be fitted for constant and easy use, their forms are generally well designed for their uses, and are, therefore, not disagreeable. A spoon, for instance, in its general shape, is often as good as it could be made; for, although its curves are not the most beautiful, they are natural, and could not be made very admirable without injury to the spoon's usefulness. So the best-designed tumbler or water-goblet is not very beautiful in form, and the worst is not very ugly in form. The range of excellence possible to such utilities is not large, and the manufacturer must approximate to a well-known and established standard of convenient shape. Our knives and forks, and plates and dishes, are not models of graceful form, but we can use them contentedly because we have the feeling that they could not be made much better,—that their shapes are suitable and convenient—and that the suitable and convenient shape of a purely utilitarian thing is not disagreeable. In this case is the exact reverse of the fact concerning tables and chairs, and such other furniture, for the shapes of these things, we found, were often bad for use, and nearly always unmeaning and ugly.

There is still another reason, allied to the last. The ornament applied to our larger furniture we found to be obtrusive, unnatural, and ugly. But the ornament of our table furniture is often more suitable and always less offensive. It is either bright colors and gold in small quantities, or it is little details of form, which indeed injure the general form of the object, but not seriously, or it is such almost unnoticed embossing and engraving as lends an air of perfectness and finish to the utensil which bears it, without asking much attention for itself. Much of this ornament, too, is natural, fit for and suggested by the material and construction of that to which it is applied.

What we have said of the superiority of table furniture over other household articles is true only of the simpler kinds of table furniture. The larger, costlier, more elaborate things are almost as bad in silver or in glass as in rosewood or in walnut. The moment the maker thinks that ornamental design is required of him, that moment he is lost, and all his work is wrong.

Let us speak, briefly, of vessels and utensils of silver and gold, glass and pottery. And first of the precious metals. Art of the highest order and most perfect development has, in past times, been embodied in silver and gold plate. Some of the greatest painters and sculptors have been educated in the goldsmith's shop. The arts of modelling the figures of men and animals, of engraving, of enamelling, of setting jewels, and of general design in graceful form are all concerned in the making of gold and silver plate. Now, of course, it is just as inexcusable to produce bad art in silver and six inches high as in bronze and colossal. It is just as desirable that engraving should be truthful and beautiful in silver and itself for the eye, as in steel and reversed for printing off upon paper. But the designers, modellers, and engravers of the silversmiths' workshops are not sufficiently accomplished artists to anything very good. Now and then, indeed, a race-cup or regatta-prize has little silver sailors or horsemen about it, showing good intentions and some skill. Now and then a piece of engraving, done to order for an amateur who desires a class of work that will hardly sell over the counter, has liveliness and spirit in design, and some knowledge of drawing in the execution. But these things are few, and even these things of but little real value as works of art. And the swinging silver kettles, the tall celery-goblets, the salvers and trays, the cake-baskets, the coffee urns—all these aristocratic necessaries, costing from seventy to three hundred dollars "gold," are quite devoid of any such artistic value at all. We have never seen for sale in a New York, Boston, or Philadelphia shop, a single article of any of the kinds named above that was in any respect really good art. There is a difference in gracefulness of general shape; one year's fashions are less bad than another's; one dealer's ware is generally made from better patterns than another's. But it is as the difference between the coats of one year and another, or made by one tailor and another; they are either positively ugly or negatively uninteresting, and there is no greater difference between them than this.

The barbarous folly we call *following the fashion*, has more to do with the worthlessness of our plate than any other single cause. How can the bad case be bettered, while the silver-ware of to-day will not serve for ten years hence? Is the workman likely to work with enjoyment and ambition, and give his soul and mind to the study of the higher graces of his art, when his work is not to last? The new patterns of each year are brought into the shop, and he gets the necessary knowledge of them and works by them, knowing that new ones are coming in six months; knowing, too, that in six years the coffee-pot, finished to day, will be brought back to be melted up and made into an urn of some new design. Do not imagine that Cellini would ever have given his attention to silver ware, if this method had been followed in his day. A rich and beautiful piece of plate should be as indestructible by any wilful act of man as a bronze statue; as permanent a thing.

Some attempts have been made to produce church plate of good design, but these attempts are generally limited to copying mediæval chalices and patterns. Yet even this is better than going on as we do with domestic plate, producing new fashions every year, and managing so badly that the work of any period more than fifty years gone by is better than our best work now, and is worthy to be bought and saved for its superior artistic merit. We cannot now enter into the wide subject of church plate; but there is one lesson to be learned from the experience of those who have studied this subject, namely, that we must study the arts of past times carefully and reverently, assured that even the every-day work of an artistic age can teach us more than the best work of an age which does not care for art.

If we ever get good domestic plate we must then abandon a bad habit which we had better abandon now. The desire to have everything look new leads possessors of silver-ware to polish it with rouge and with powders sold for the purpose by the silversmiths, giving it the unnatural and disagreeable gloss seen on the silver exposed for sale in the show cases and show windows. Persons who live with private families as waiters or butlers frequently possess or claim to possess the secret of some preparation by which the new look of silver shall be continually renewed. We have seen silver ware which had been for years in constant use, out of which all scratches and signs of wear were weekly removed, and the mirror-like polish of the shops given to the surface of the metal. It is evident that this cannot be done without constantly wearing down the silver. Scratches are little cuts into the surface; they can be removed only by wearing down the metal around them as deep as they. Silver-ware treated in this way always looks rounded and worn at the edges in a very disagreeable manner, and all delicate details, engraving, patterns in relief, &c., suffer from the process. But the principal objection applies to all the devices for polishing silver, and is this, that the polish is ugly and is not natural to silver at all. The silversmiths do not call it *polishing*, this rubbing with rouge, they call it *coloring*, and they are right in their technical word; the process gives a color to the dish or goblet which is not the color of silver at all. Silver looks as it should, if it is carefully washed, after being used, with soap and water. If it gets a stain, the spot must be taken out, and whiting or "silver soap" will be necessary, but these or other detergents and all polishing powders and brushes should be banished from daily use. No one, surely, thinks that "colored" silver is more beautiful than silver not so disguised, but every one sees that it looks new, and as if just bought, and that is so desirable! When we outgrow this passion for new things, and learn that old ones, which are perfect in form and usefulness, are better for being old, we shall send rouge and Tripoli powder to the light-house keepers, and engineers of locomotives, who really need them for their silver-plated reflectors, and trust to clean our own silver as we do our china, by hot water and soap.

The love of glitter which helps to make popular the abuse of which we have just spoken is seen in another matter of even greater importance, the general use of cut glass. Glass was known to the Romans and to the people of the middle ages as a ductile material which could be moulded and cast and blown easily into the most graceful and fanciful shapes: could be stained of any color, could be decorated with colored patterns of the most varied and fanciful devices, and, when finished, was light and more or less transparent. Cut glass was not unknown, but it seems to have been generally made to imitate jewels, and, indeed, some pieces of this work which came down from the Romans, were supposed until very recently to be jewels, and have been guarded as such in cathedral treasuries. The beautiful forms and delicate ornament of the Venetian and German glass of the middle ages remain to us as almost perfect examples of what glass-ware should be. But for about a century the notion has prevailed that glass ought to look like crystal, and that the chief decorative purpose to which it can be put is to be cut to as many faces and angles as possible, that it may flash and glitter as much as possible.

There are purposes for which cut glass is well fitted, but of these the purpose of decoration is not one. It is entirely unfit for anything which is meant to be beautiful. Glass-ware is made beautiful by form, color, and ornament engraved or stamped upon it. Cut glass cannot be beautiful in any of these ways—a vessel wholly or principally of cut glass is never beautiful. A thing cannot well be beautiful in form when its outline, turn it how you will, is always a series of short, broken lines, making irregular angles with each other. A cut-glass goblet or pitcher consists principally of an irregular polyhedron of a great number of sides. Take up your cut-glass goblet or pitcher, turn it about, see if it is beautiful in any aspect or position; see if anything designed on the same principle can be beautiful. Do not suppose that it must be right, whether it looks so to you or not, because crystals are like it. Crystals are not like it. Crystals, themselves among the least beautiful mineral forms, are exceedingly regular and symmetrical, are generally small, are seldom seen singly in nature, but almost always clustered into groups of striking symmetry and system, and the fairest of them are very rich in color. A large, colorless, comparatively unsymmetrical crystal is as nearly ugly as anthing in nature. Ask any painter if he care to make a study of it. And yet it would be beautiful in comparison with a costly and perfect piece of cut glass. Ask any painter if he care to make a study of *that*. Not, observe, a picture of it, to sell; half-oranges and whole apples in a cut-glass dish—many painters will do that, as they will paint full-length life-size portraits of statesmen buttoned up in black frock coats.

The best glass-ware ordinarily sold in the shops is the plain, smooth, thin ware, very simple in shape, which is made into wine-glasses of four sizes, and water-goblets. These are not as dear as the best cut glass, but dearer than "pressed" glass; they have the disadvantage of breaking easily; but, so far as we know the china-stores of the great cities, the intelligent buyer's choice is limited to these or white china mugs. Not always, though. During the last winter some very good sherry and claret glasses were brought from England, and for sale on Broadway. They were well formed to take the minimum risk of breakage, and were graceful enough and stood firmly. A little decoration in color was applied to them; they were engraved with crimson quatrefoils and trefoils, in one case, with spiral lines of crimson in another, with a conventional flower pattern of blue in a third. Claret-jugs are sometimes imported by the silversmiths, and fitted with silver lids and spouts; and of these a few are very good; very fine in form, with quiet, subtle curves for outlines, and decorated with engraved leaf patterns and ferns and vines. These are luxuries. Indeed it is impossible to get anything beautiful, made of glass, except at an exorbitant price. Nothing good is made in this country, and the importer who fetches any really good thing from abroad, runs a great risk of not selling his importation, and must be well paid for it.

Although the English send us now very beautiful work, they have given us one foolish custom, which it will be well for us to abandon, namely the use of colored wine glasses. They are known as "hock-glasses," and are about as appropriate to the purpose as the ugly word from which they take their name. When Port, Sherry, Claret and Madeira, were the only drink in England, and wines of other countries and other kinds were almost unknown there, the name of one of the more commonly seen or better liked of these, Hochheimer, was cut down to Hock, and given to all German wines together. At the same time the pale yellow color of these wines (the red German wines not being easily transportable or often exported) seemed as feeble as their taste to the drinkers of darker-colored and more fiery sorts. Where Sherry and Madeira were called *white* wines, what would naturally be thought of Hochheimer and Rüdesheimer? So, green glasses were invented. The use of these has even spread to Germany, and pale-red glasses are also used there and here. There seems to be no excuse for it. The color of yellow German wine is beautiful; scarce any two varieties are of exactly the same shade, but all are lovely. The most perfectly colorless glasses should be used for them, and they will light up the table like an August sunset.

Colored glass might be used to advantage for finger-bowls, and for fruit dishes for the larger fruit; not for drinking glasses for water, for it should be easily seen that the water is spotless, but in many cases other than this. There is ample room for improvement in this matter of colored glass, but we have not space to consider it at present.

It is the general voice of European writers on art, that the manufacture of pottery, in all its different departments, is far in advance of other manufactures in the artistic merit of the work done. There is, they all say, one thing of primary importance left to be done—to get the cheaper kind of china-ware and stone-ware better in form. If this were done, we are told, good porcelain, china, or earthenware vessels would be procurable by anybody for any purpose; good in form, in color, in surface, and in design of surface ornament.

This is true. But there is one thing more to be done before another golden age of pottery shall have come. Not only must good work be within reach of all; bad work must be put out of reach. It should be made impossible to make or to sell the bad things which are offered us at every turn.

It is very hard to find well-decorated china in America. Beautifully thin and fine in texture, and brilliant in color it is, and the color-patterns are put on with great skill and neatness, their surface flat and uniform, and their edges sharp. But the forms are seldom good; never except in the most expensive French china, and seldom even in that. And the patterns, except those which are most simple and delicate, are not beautiful or appropriate, badly designed, and made up of ill-combined colors. If one should want a really beautiful tea-set in a hurry, or even a few single pieces, his only chance will be to find a little Chinese or Japanese porcelain. However beautiful in color this may be, and however admirable in spirit and life are the designs of, at least, the Japanese porcelain, it is not creditable to Europe and America that New York should remain so nearly dependent upon the East for china-ware which shall not disgrace her dinner-tables.

The importers treat us very badly, and select in Europe with singular want of judgment. Perhaps this is more evident in respect to china-ware than in any other department of industrial art. What are the American manufacturers to do? They dare not produce good designs of their own, or reproduce good designs from abroad, when they see that buyers are content to receive and pay extravagant prices for the worst designs that can be found in the catalogues of the great French and English makers.

They are not vases that we care to see imported, nor biscuit statuettes, nor any of the more expensive and uncommon *chefs-d'œuvre* of ceramic art; but dinner sets and tea sets, piles of plates, dozens of cups and saucers, fruit dishes, tea-pots, pitchers and jugs. We want these, of the cheapest earthenware,—when any is found good in shape, and at least not wrongly colored; and of the costliest white china—when it is ascertained where the most beautiful can be found; and of all the grades between. There are gentlemen in Europe now collecting, at great cost and trouble to themselves, specimens of the most beautiful and valuable porcelains of bygone times—a plate here and a vase there of rich and splendid ware, which will teach us a great deal in decoration. But we want, also, modern and contemporary work that we may know how our fellows in Europe are succeeding, and that our manufacturers may see more clearly than they now can, that china may be made after good designs, and money made by it still. Of the hundreds of Americans now going to Europe, or already there, we hope that a few will spend a little money on good china, bring it home, and exhibit it to the world in Haughwout's or Collamore's window.

BOOK-MAKING.

From the New York Tribune.

A PARAGRAPH in the last number of the *London Review* is of such particular concern to American publishers that we are led to add a few suggestions to those which we presented the other day for the benefit of our friends at the Trade-Sale Rooms. The *Review* says:

"At the present moment, several agents from the large booksellers of the cities just mentioned (Boston, New York and Philadelphia) are over here, purchasing stock and making arrangements. Of several English books, we hear of as many as one, two, and even three thousand copies being purchased by these agents for shipment across the Atlantic. Fine books, or those of an illustrated or expensive character, are mostly sought after."

Some portion of the American demand for English books is natural and will probably always continue; but the fact that our booksellers find it profitable to import new books by the thousand copies is a very pregnant one. It is an evidence at once that the taste of numerous American buyers has been well cultivated, and that the means of gratifying it do not exist on this side the Atlantic. If the ten or fifteen thousand copies of new books that are to be imported this fall could be manufactured here, they would be. The fact that we send abroad for them is a confession of the inferiority of our domestic productions; and it is a fact of which our publishers and printers are bound to take notice. The taste for English-printed books does exist, and will increase; and can only be made profitable to American printers when the latter approach the standard of their rivals across the water. Nor can any question of cost of production stop our improvement.

Reckoning exchange, duty, and at least two intermediate profits, the imported English book stands its purchaser in a round sum which would much more than pay the cost of manufacture here. At one time, when gold was at 250, the English shilling was computed in importing as equal to the American dollar; and, if the rate has since been somewhat reduced, it is still very far from being what it was before the war—about 33 cents. There is, therefore, and will continue to be, a large margin for increasing the prices of American books, if that were what is necessary to bring them up to the London mark.

But we apprehend something else is wanting. The want of skill, the want of taste, and to some extent the want of the best material, we commented on the other day. What is not less necessary to success than either of these is—conscientiousness. The statement may be questioned, but it is true. Our printers do not do the very best they know how to do—whether because they are not paid for being conscientious, and cannot afford to be, or for whatever reason; but the fact that they do not, they will probably admit, and in many cases even will assert, throwing the responsibility for it upon the publishers who decline to pay for first-class work. Yet the book-buying public will not refuse to pay for first-class work, as is abundantly proved by their paying immense prices for English books; and immense prices, we may add, for large paper copies of American books that aspire to rival the English.

We need cite but a single example of the destructive haste with which books are poured out from American presses, viz: the great number of sheets sent to the binder before they are dry, and which appear in the market in book form hopelessly disfigured by "off-setting"—that is, by the damp impression on one page printing off on another. Many and many a copy of well-known books have we turned over in the stores to find one free from this blemish, and often in vain. The register of the book is so imperfect that the defect of off-setting becomes the more conspicuous—in the head lines of the page especially. Indeed, this particular fault is so common in books otherwise well-printed that purchasers should make a point of examining every copy to detect it. And we know of no better way to put an end to such slovenly work than for buyers to reject rigidly every volume that is thus injured, stating why they reject it, and letting the retailer return it to the publisher as defective and unsalable. That will speedily discourage a practice which grows out of the haste with which it is deemed necessary to get books upon the market. The publishers are primarily responsible; but any printer who values his reputation should peremptorily refuse to let fresh sheets leave his office till the ink is thoroughly dry and ready for the binder.

There is another sort of disfigured book we would have every buyer reject—those, viz: which attack him with an advertisement opposite the title. It has grown to be common, of late, for publishers to advertise on the reverse of the fly-title, facing the title-page proper, so that purchaser or reader cannot possibly turn to the title of the book he buys or consults, without being affronted by this thrusting of other wares upon his notice. Worse even than this are some books which bear an advertisement upon the back of the title-page itself, so that it is impossible to tear out the advertisement except by tearing out the title. This latter abomination is not yet, we are happy to say, very common; but it may grow to any extent unless buyers refuse to touch those books in which the publishers' cards are inserted in such a way that they cannot be removed without injury to the book itself. To a catalogue at the end of the volume, after the fly-leaves, there is no objection.

This sort of criticism upon books, we shall be told, is not customary. True, it is not, but it should be. We know of no reason why a book should not be criticised as a picture is; for a really well-printed book is a work of art, and we need not expect good books, any more than good pictures, without independent and judicious criticism. It is necessary to point out defects. It is especially necessary in books, at this moment, because something of the effort which should be spent in improvement is spent in persuading the public that there is no need of improvement. Our printers and publishers should remember that their real interests and future prosperity are intimately connected with their continual improvement, and that, if they do not want—as we certainly do not—to read any more such paragraphs as that quoted above from the London *Review*, they must resolutely set themselves to the task of making their own productions equal in every respect to those of Great Britain. No one will rejoice more than we when that shall have been done.

What we say on this subject refers of course to the gratification of a taste, proper in itself, for expensive books, and to the effort of our publishers to satisfy that taste. That is a wholly distinct matter from printing cheap books for the people, which are needed for diffusing intelligence among those whom dear books never could reach. We trust the day will never come when we shall have fewer cheap books in proportion than we now have. But the two wants are not inconsistent; they are complemental to each other. Theodore Parker always insisted that there should be editions of his works adapted to the popular purse. George Livermore was equally careful that his "Historical Research" should appear in good type and on superfine paper, but afterward printed a common edition for general circulation. The two tastes do not in the least interfere, nor will the making of elegant books ever lessen the number of those sold at a lower price.

THE FESTIVITIES OF SPITHEAD.

From the Saturday Review.

THE wits or cynics of the Channel Fleet have invented the unspeakably humorous device of pronouncing the well-worn phrase, the *entente cordiale*, as the "ancient cordial." The most remarkable effect of the recent interchange of hospitality between them and their allies, or rivals, seemed to themselves to be due quite as much to cordials, more or less ancient, as to the exhilarating consciousness that they were celebrating a great and peaceful moral victory. Sailors are proverbially easy to please in the matter of jests, and if one or two simple requisites are complied with, their enjoyment is secure. So the success and popularity of the significant joke of the "ancient cordial" have been unbounded. Its humor even stimulated the hilarity to which it pointed, and the more men laughed at the joke the more ready they were to interpret the joke in earnest. At Brest, it appears, the way in which the midshipmen of the two navies were obliged, after dinner, to lend one another charitable succor in the difficult task of preserving the position which distinguishes man from the lower animals, was a beautiful illustration of the advantages of international brotherhood. And at Spithead, the vigorous and striking dances which took place after dinner in the manner first introduced to public notice by Mr. Spurgeon, on the quarter-deck of more than one of the English iron-clads, were hailed as fresh proofs of the strength of the "ancient cordial." Indeed, the predicament of an English officer who had to entertain a French guest without knowing a word of his guest's language evidently was one which excused him in seeking aspiration at the readiest source. Moderate draughts of champagne proved the best means available for creating a universal language, and men who over the soup were darkly ignorant of French found they had got quite a lively fluency and a correct accent by the time of dessert. The curse brought upon the earth by the builders of the Tower of Babel ceases to blight the social intercourse of men who have well dined. And it is worth noticing that the prejudices of the complacent and patriotic Briton received a strong shock on finding that, while the majority of the English officers were unable to get beyond the never varying and servicable "weee," the officers of the French ships could nearly all speak English with tolerable fluency. But the French are more unwilling to do things badly than the audacious Briton, and consequently an English officer would frequently go on for a couple of hours talking the very vilest French to people who, as it in time vexatiously appeared, could have talked to him in very decent English. Considering the contemptuous pride that we have about knowing foreign languages better and more widely than the foreigners know other languages, this should scarcely be overlooked. The fact that French naval officers are compelled to know something of English, as one of their qualifications, will perhaps attract attention at the Admiralty, and give more trouble to the seafaring youth of this country.

But the common notion that all Englishmen know French, while scarcely any Frenchmen know English, was not the only prejudice which suffered a shock. For instance, it was discovered that it is possible to be a Frenchman, and still be more than five feet high. The time-honored principle, too, that one Englishman can fight three Frenchmen, and beat them, did not receive much encouragement. On the whole, the strength and build of the French crews and officers were quite up to the mark of our own. The idea of a French sailor as a weedy, unseamanlike kind of "loafer" is about as true as that the being in the Parisian farces, with long blonde whiskers waving in the wind, perpetually demanding porter, and ejaculating ceaseless *Godams*, is the type of an English gentleman. The Portsmouth boatmen relieved their wounded feelings by the repeated but scarcely relevant assertion—first, that there is not a French man-of-war which has not English seamen on board; and secondly, that the Dutch are better sailors than the French. It was also a source of comfort to the patriot to find that the interior of the French ships was scarcely as trim and clean as our own. But if the patriot had the fortune to be a reasonable being as well, even this pleasant ground of self-congratulation was cut away by the reflection that the Frenchmen had just come from sea, and could not therefore be expected to be trim and clean. In fact, the only points in which the old-fashioned sailors, both officers and men, felt sure that the French were open to just rebuke, and were clearly our inferiors, seemed to be two. First, instead of English they all speak French, which, as everybody knows, is a poor and thin kind of tongue. Secondly, they are so lost to all sense of what is proper and becoming as to take a slice of melon after their soup. If it comes to argument, perhaps there is as much to be said for taking fruit after soup as there is for taking it after game. But then one does not generally go to naval people with a view to argument. Nor were the English officers more shocked by this scandalous intrusion of the melon before the salmon and the roast beef than they were horrified by the shameless prevalence of the cigar. On an English man-of-war, as everybody knows, you may only smoke at certain times, not very frequent, and in certain spots which are not very extensive. On going on board the French iron-clads, it was found that the French officers smoked anywhere and at any time. The truth is that, in some graver points as well as in trifles, the English authorities love restrictions, just because they are restrictions. To a disciplinarian—and there are not many naval officers who are not disciplinarians—a rule is a rule, and ought to be strictly preserved on that ground only, without any reference to the more fundamental question whether it is needful or not. A wise man thinks that the fewer rules there are in the world the better. An English military or naval functionary commonly acts as if he thought just the reverse. In France, it is a very curious fact that, while in civil matters they are so much more harassed by strict rules and formalities than we are, in the army and navy they give everybody as much room for having his own way as is consistent with sound discipline. Yet nobody pretends that the French army or navy is any the worse for this. In England, the notion is not yet by any means shaken off that a man ought to be ashamed of enjoying himself. The most harmless pleasures are still looked upon as weaknesses which everybody should try to overcome; and smoking, particularly, is a practice which all official persons, from railway porters up to post-captains, have an express mission to discourage and put down.

The hospitality appears to have been rather more creditably managed than such matters usually are in this country, though there is not an officer in the English fleet who does not at once admit that the French know how to manage these things, and we do not. But a good deal of nonsense is talked in this way. There is nothing in the nature and scheme of the universe which precludes Englishmen, any more than Frenchmen, from giving tasteful and social entertainments. In some English society hospitality is practised with as perfect success as anywhere in the world. The only reason why we bungle all public festivities is that we are overwhelmed and paralysed by a stupid idea of our own incapacity. Everybody tells us that we don't know how to manage hospitality on a large scale with grace and ease, and we have been told this so long and so persistently that it has come to be true. After all, incapacity to entertain with success is only another name for a mixture of indolence and silly shyness and want of confidence. It is not because the managers are English that, as was said to be the case at Portsmouth, three thousand persons were invited to a ball, when it was known that the rooms could only hold seven hundred. It is because they are something which we are happy to think is not yet quite synonymous with English that such a folly as this is perpetrated. People do not give themselves enough trouble about public entertainments in this country. They think that a successful banquet, or a great ball, or a procession requires no organization or forethought, but will in some mysterious manner arrange itself. For instance, the only things needed to prevent the egregious confusion and failure of the famous welcome to Garibaldi were forethought and hard work on the part of those who got up the procession. The wretchedness of the arrangements on the occasions of the Princess Alexandra's entry into London and the marriage of the Prince of Wales was simply due to the stupid indolence of the officials, who too piously left everything in the hands of Providence. Whenever the proper pains are taken, all goes smoothly enough. The ball given to the Prince and Princess of Wales by the City Corporation was perfectly successful, notwithstanding the subsequent abstraction of combs and brushes and fancy soap-dishes. And the festivities of the iron-clads were successful, because the caterers took trouble and did their best.

It does not seem at all necessary to seek for any profound moral or political significance in the Spithead gaieties. There will be no beating of swords into pruning-hooks as a result. Guests and hosts were equally aware of the possible destination of the pyramids of cannon-ball which graced the decks on which they were dining. The pyramids were not there for ornament, and millions of money were not spent upon iron-clads for pastime. If the mutual salutes and hospitalities meant very much more than a convenient and amusing holiday for the two squadrons, the works of the Spithead forts, one of which is just appearing above the water, would be a great deal too costly a piece of supererogation. The officers, whose profession is fighting, might have been excused if they had failed in their hearts to recognize the beauty and desirableness of a never-ending peace. As it is, perhaps those among them who are of a logical turn of mind will wonder why two prize-fighters should strip, and anxiously compare their muscles and fists, as the most suitable preliminary to a deliberate retirement into private life. Still, if it is only a holiday, it has been a peculiarly novel and agreeable holiday. The French have seen our iron-clads, and are glad to think that they can certainly beat us in speed. We have seen theirs, and are confident that in every other respect but speed we are more than a match for them. Both nations can only hope that the diversity of opinion may never be brought to the only possible test.

MODERN DRESS.

From the London Review.

THERE are certain questions of social reform which are, from time to time, brought before the public, discussed with more or less ability, and having afforded ample scope for ingenious suggestions, are again allowed to drop into oblivion. It is the fate of our national costume—or rather let us say of European costume (for it contains but little element of nationality)—to be treated in this manner. Male attire in this country is not only unbecoming, but frequently inconvenient, and in some respects unhealthy to the wearer. But an Englishwoman's dress promises to add to these three unfortunate qualities a fourth, which we will leave the ultra-moralists to define. M. Dupin has just published a pamphlet "On the Unbridled Luxury of Women." If, in a country where Fashion holds her sternest sway, the extravagance of Parisian belles has attracted the attention of the State, let us hope that some protest will follow on this side of the Channel; for whatever value we may set on the taste of a French milliner, there are higher considerations than the cut of a dress or the shape of a bonnet, which we should be sorry to see our wives and daughters lose sight of. It is, however, much more easy to to censure the follies of modern dress than to propose a remedy for them, or even to assign a cause for their existence. Take, for example, that often and justly abused invention—crinoline. Under the names of hoop and farthingale, it was twice in vogue in this country before it was revived for a third time in 1857. We have abundant proof that it was both ridiculed and seriously condemned by our ancestors. Yet neither satire nor sermons seem to have affected its use. All that we know is the fact that women wore it as long as it pleased them, and left it off when it ceased to do so. But the old hoop, it will be urged, seemed appropriate to the costume which accompanied it; it went well with patches, high-heeled shoes, and powdered hair. Besides, it was a more honest and less complicated affair than the present one, and not requiring so much stuff to cover it, there was less danger to apprehend from fire. But is it probable that these reasons, or any similar reasons, ensured a popularity for the hoop or farthingale which the crinoline will not command? Is it not a fact that, in spite of many petty inconveniences which it occasions—in spite of its being utterly unsuitable to the rest of a lady's toilette—in spite of the charges of indelicacy and extravagance which have been so frequently brought against it—in spite of the terrible and untimely deaths which have ensued from its use, this wretched invention still continues in full favor with women, after eight years' trial in this boasted nineteenth century?

Take another instance—the modern gentleman's hat, of which the beaver prototype was introduced here about the time of the French revolution. Could anything more ugly, more incommodious, more unhealthy, more generally objectionable, be devised as a covering for the head? Yet, so far from its use being discontinued, as was thought probable during the year of the first Great Exhibition, no part of a man's dress appears to be further removed from all chance of improvement than this. No one who values position in society—no one who cares for the public recognition of his friends—would venture to wear any substitute for it in the streets of London. Men go on enduring this evil with aching brows—just as women go on enduring another sort of martyrdom—simply for the sake of appearances, and because, as civilized life is now constituted, singularity of dress would be considered, in nine cases out of ten, a vulgar affectation.

Hopeless as reform seems to be, as far as hats and hoops are concerned, it is satisfactory to think that some slight improvements in dress have been made during the latter half of the present century. If the Exhibition of '51 had not the effect of exterminating the "chimney-pot," it brought over thousands of foreigners who had long eschewed the use of the razor. Englishmen began to ask themselves whether the prejudice against beards, which had existed in the days of the "great unwashed"—our forefathers—should be allowed to extend to our own time, when every gentleman takes his morning bath. Was it not absurd that we should continue day by day, with no little pains and inconvenience, to rasp our faces for the purpose of removing an appendage which Nature had given us for use if not for ornament? The "beard movement" rapidly became popular—the newspapers took up the cause, and said what they could in its favor. In the course of a few years, a clean-shaved man became the exception in a crowd. Thenceforth the hideous and uncomfortable *vater-mörden*—the stand-up collars, which had for more than a quarter of a century prevented us from freely turning our heads to the right or left, were banished from young England's wardrobe. An unpleasant reason had been assigned for the origin of the modern stock. It was whispered that a late monarch swathed up his neck in folds of silk or cambric to conceal a natural blemish, and that a polite court followed the Royal example. Be that as it may, no precedent for the fashion continued to exist save that which might be found in the dress of a few old fogies and antiquated club-loungers. Even the thick silk handkerchief, which succeeded to the stock, gave place at last to that light and comfortable tie or scarf which is now almost universally used with a turn-down collar.

But the progress of reform did not stop here. Wellington boots were, after all, only a modification of the old "Hessian" type, which, however convenient when pantaloons were worn, became necessary under the folds of the modern trouser. Accordingly the ancle-boot was adopted. At first it was fastened with buttons, and this led to the invention of the button-hook—an article which was perpetually being mislaid and which generally tore out more buttons than it helped to fasten. But the later manufacture of "Balmorals" for country wear and the "side-spring" for ordinary use, left nothing to be desired in this respect. It is hardly necessary to enumerate the various modifications which have helped to improve a modern gentleman's dress. Most of us recollect the old coat-collar which used to rise from the shoulders of the wearer in a padded roll until it touched the back of his head. That ungainly feature has long since resumed its proper place and proportions. The waistcoat now terminates, not as formerly across the widest part of the chest, but at the waist. Even sleeves and trousers, the most uncompromising details of a man's attire, have of late been allowed to partake in general outline of the shape of those limbs which they enclose. The morning coat, though not, perhaps, as picturesque as it was a hundred years ago, is infinitely better than that which was in vogue in the early part of this century.

Still there is great room for improvement. We want a style of dress which shall be at once picturesque and comfortable. It must be fitted for the ordinary vocations of life. It must be of a material which will not spot or spoil in a shower. It must be of a design which either a tall or a short man may wear without making him look too conspicuous. The Knickerbocker suit, for example, fulfils all these conditions admirably, and we believe has been adopted for ordinary wear in many country gentlemen's houses. With some slight alterations in point of material, etc., it might be used very well in towns, and those who have had to walk in trousers through London mud would soon learn to appreciate the change. Above all, our evening dress needs radical reform. How it happens that black cloth has come to be associated with occasions of public and private festivity in common with occasions of public and private mourning is a riddle which we must leave posterity to solve. But it is certain that in the existing state of society, Englishmen wear the same dress at an evening party and at a funeral. We might go further, and remind our readers that many a host who entertains his friends at dinner has a butler behind his chair who is dressed precisely like himself. To add to this confusion, the clergyman who rises to say grace might, so far as his apparel goes, be mistaken for either. This is not as it should be, and we were glad to hear some time ago that the Prince of Wales contemplated the suggestion of a complete change in evening dress. It is only through the agency of such an example that we could ever hope to escape from the conventional ugliness of a modern tail-coat, and looking at the subject from a common-sense, as well as an artistic point of view, we really think that his Royal Highness might turn his attention to this matter with great benefit to the public.

With regard to ladies' dress in England at the present time, a little alteration would make it—in form at all events—a very pretty and picturesque costume. In the early part of this century "waists" were far too high. About fifteen years ago they were much too low. Now, they are just where they should be. Skirts are full and of ample length; bodices and sleeves are deftly shaped and decorated. The arrangement of the hair (always supposing it to be real) is perhaps, on the whole, as good as it has ever been in this country. But two abuses remain to be rectified—viz., the elaborate bonnet and the obtrusive crinoline. No doubt, in course of time, they will be rectified. Meanwhile we are content to wait. The ways of the world are continually changing. There is a fashion in music, in poetry, in painting, in medicine, in politics—in religion. We need not, therefore be surprised to find one in dress.

SENATOR CONNESS ON FESSENDEN AND SUMNER.

I HAD a little talk with Conness.